PROCEEDINGS

of the

CONSERVATION STRATEGY WORKSHOP

Winnipeg, Manitoba - May 17, 1989

An Event Prior to the Conference
"Environment and Economy: Partners for the Future"

SPONSORED BY
THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
ENVIRONMENT CANADA

December 1989

These proceedings were produced directly from the workshop transcripts. Comments and the opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of Environment Canada.

Available from:

Strategy Development Division
Sustainable Development and State of
Environment Reporting Branch
Environment Canada
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3

This publication is printed on paper containing 100% recycled fibres.
The cover contains 50% to 80% recycled fibres.

91-03109/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE WORKSHOP AGENDA	page 1
THE PANEL	page 2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	page 3
PREFACE	page 5
INTRODUCTION	page 7
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	page 9
PRESENTATIONS	
MODERATOR'S PRELIMINARY REMARKS	page 13
HIGHLIGHTS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY* (Presented by Moderator: Dr. Leslie Whitby)	page 15
ARCTIC MARINE CONSERVATION STRATEGY Elizabeth Snider	page 19
YUKON CONSERVATION STRATEGY Dr. Tim McTiernan	page 23
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY Jamie Bastedo	page 31
TOWARDS A CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR QUEBEC Bertrand Tétreault	page 35
ALBERTA CONSERVATION STRATEGY Mike Kelly	page 41
COMMENTS ON THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS Diane Griffin	page 47

*see Annex A for details

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

STATUS OF WORLD CONSERVATION STRATEGY II AND COMMENTS ON PROCESS
Robert Prescott-Allen — page 51

QUESTIONS ONE THROUGH TEN WITH COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION — page 55

MODERATOR'S CLOSING REMARKS — page 71

ANNEXES

ANNEX A THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY
Kingsley Lewis — page 75

ANNEX B REPORT ON THE INUIT REGIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY
Nancy Doubleday — page 83

ANNEX C LIST OF PARTICIPANTS — page 87

ANNEX D CONSERVATION/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY CONTACTS — page 97

ANNEX E STATUS OF PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT — page 101

CONSERVATION STRATEGY WORKSHOP
WEDNESDAY, MAY 17
8:45 AM TO 12:00 NOON
CAMPAIGN SOUTH ROOM, HOLIDAY INN
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

AGENDA

8:45 AM - 8:50 AM	INTRODUCTION
8:50 AM - 10:10 AM	FOUR PANEL SPEAKERS
10:10 AM - 10:25 AM	COFFEE BREAK
10:25 AM - 11:00 AM	TWO PANEL SPEAKERS
11:00 AM - 12:00 PM	FACILITATED DISCUSSION TO DEVELOP SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE CONSERVATION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

PANEL

MODERATOR

Dr. LESLIE WHITBY:
Director, Sustainable Development Branch, Environment Canada

PANELISTS*

Ms. ELIZABETH SNIDER:
Chief, Northern Fisheries Operations, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
"Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy"

Dr. TIM McTIERNAN:
Director, Policy and Planning Branch, Department of Renewable Resources, Yukon Territory
"Yukon Conservation Strategy"

Mr. JAMIE BASTEDO:
Senior Policy Analyst, Department of Renewable Resources, Northwest Territories
"Northwest Territories Sustainable Development Strategy"

M. BERTRAND TÉTREAULT:
Président, Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement, Québec
"Vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement"

Mr. MIKE KELLY:
Senior Research Officer, Environment Council of Alberta
"Alberta Conservation Strategy"

Ms. DIANE GRIFFIN:
Executive Director of the Island Nature Trust in Prince Edward Island and member of the Prince Edward Island and National Round Tables

(UNABLE TO ATTEND)

Mr. KINGSLEY LEWIS:
Director, Provincial Planning Branch, Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, Prince Edward Island
"A Conservation Strategy for Prince Edward Island"

Ms. NANCY DOUBLEDAY:
International Environmental Coordinator, Inuit Circumpolar Conference
"Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy"

* Affiliations are listed as they were at the time of the workshop.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend special thanks to the panelists who invested much time and effort in preparing their presentations for the workshop and proposing recommendations to improve the process based on their own experiences. In addition, I want to thank Ruth McKechnie and her staff Annick Le Hénaff, Dennis O'Farrell and John Crook for their efforts in organizing the workshop, developing and arranging supporting materials, compiling the recommendations and preparing these proceedings. Finally, thanks to everyone who attended the workshop and contributed to the discussion.

Leslie Whitby

PREFACE

> "A conservation strategy is a guide for the sustainable use of our resources and the environment. It contains objectives, principles, and actions designed to ensure that the use and management of resources today will allow ourselves and future generations to maintain or improve the quality and standard of living, and allow those less fortunate today the opportunity to improve their lot. Sustainability requires that resource use be environmentally, economically and socially sound."[1]

The original impetus for developing strategies comes from the 1980 World Conservation Strategy (WCS).[2] The three objectives of the WCS are still seen as the core of many strategies today:

- the maintenance of essential ecological processes and life support systems;
- the preservation of genetic diversity; and
- the sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems.

In 1987, the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM) set-up the National Task Force on Environment and Economy (NTFEE) to foster and promote environmentally sound economic development. This was in response to the visit to Canada in 1986 of the World Commission on Environment and Development and the findings of the 1986 International Conference on the Implementation of the World Conservation Strategy. The Task Force produced a report with over 40 recommendations calling for actions to assist Canada in its efforts to integrate environmental and economic decision-making. One of these recommendations gives a strong message regarding conservation and sustainable development strategies.

> "Every province and territory should have a conservation strategy in place by 1992. A national strategy should be prepared which integrates the provincial and territorial strategies and links them to the international scene. This work should be presented by Canada at the U.N. global conference on environment and development proposed by the World Commission on Environment and Development."[3]

---

1. Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment: Conservation Strategies: A Compendium of Canadian Experiences (1989)
2. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Wildlife Fund (WWF): World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development (1980)
3. NTFEE: Report of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy (1987, p.13)

For some jurisdictions this recommendation came after work had already begun on developing strategies, for others it has been the catalyst for starting to develop conservation or sustainable development strategies.

It should be noted that the term "sustainable development strategy" has been adopted by some jurisdictions in response to the more recent work of the World Commission on Environment and Development. While maintaining the original goals of the WCS there is an attempt to highlight the need to integrate environmental and economic issues and to place greater emphasis on the long term objective of sustainable development recognizing that conservation and preservation of natural heritage areas and important ecosystems are essential components of a strategy. Whatever the title, all of these strategies have the same common theme of integrating environmental concerns into all areas of decision-making and employing a comprehensive and anticipatory approach to environmental issues.

The Task Force report also proposed that CCREM (now CCME - The Canadian Council of Environment Ministers) host a major national conference on sustainable development in 1990 where progress on conservation strategy development would be reviewed. This national conference is being hosted by the Province of Quebec and is tentatively scheduled for sometime in 1991. The conference will set the stage for Canada's presentation at the United Nations Global Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 to be held in Brazil.

These proceedings, and the Conservation Strategy Workshop itself, contribute to the exchange of information and ideas on strategy development in Canada. This will be helpful in facilitating the coordination of activities in all jurisdictions across the country in working towards a National Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Sponsored by the Sustainable Development Branch of Environment Canada, the **Conservation Strategy Workshop** was held in Winnipeg, May 17 1989 as a pre-conference event to the "Environment and Economy: Partners for the Future" conference. Over one hundred people attended, providing those involved with an excellent opportunity to meet, exchange ideas and information and establish a basis for future cooperation.

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- o examine and discuss the **process** for developing conservation/sustainable development strategies;
- o consider what can be learned from the experience of others who are, or have been, involved in developing conservation strategies; and,
- o develop recommendations for a more effective conservation strategy development process.

The workshop was structured as a panel with six speakers from across the country who gave presentations on their respective experiences in developing a conservation/sustainable development strategy. Comments and questions were then taken from the floor.

The panelists are listed in the introductory pages of these proceedings. Kingsley Lewis and Nancy Doubleday were unable to attend due to unavoidable circumstances. Diane Griffin and Jamie Bastedo both stepped in at the last moment to round out the panel and their efforts were certainly appreciated.

The moderator, Dr. Leslie Whitby, read out a brief summary of Prince Edward Island's experiences and this has been included as part of these proceedings. In addition, text provided by Kingsley Lewis and written comments by Nancy Doubleday have also been included as annexes.

Each panelist had prepared a series of recommendations for improving the process of developing strategies. Unfortunately, time did not allow for adequate discussion of the recommendations nor a consensus on each. They do, however, provide a good sense of where the concerns and priorities lie for those who are now directly or indirectly involved in the process of developing conservation or sustainable development strategies. The recommendations are also included to stimulate further discussion and to provide suggestions for making the development process more effective.

Although not part of the original agenda, Robert Prescott-Allen - who edited and compiled the original World Conservation Strategy (WCS) - was kind enough to give a brief update on his present involvement in preparing a second edition of the WCS and outlined some of his own recommendations for an effective strategy development process.

For the sake of brevity and clarity these proceedings focus on the presentations and the discussion period - any reference to the mechanics of the workshop and comments or introductions not directly related to the subject matter were excluded. Editing was done to improve the flow of the text for the reader while preserving the meaning and flavour of the presentations and discussion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of recommendations regarding the process which were put forward by speakers and from the floor:

1. A consensus approach to the strategy development process is necessary and requires the commitment and cooperation of all the different agencies and stakeholders involved.

2. The focus should be on the process and building an infrastructure so that the process will be self-sustaining.

3. Coordinators or coordinating offices must see things through, but existing structures should be used where possible.

4. In addition to regulatory and legislative measures, equal consideration should be given to fiscal tools and educational programs.

5. Emphasis should be placed on the enforcement of new and existing legislative tools.

6. The strategy development process should have formal legislative endorsement.

7. Strategies should have unanimous endorsement in the legislature and broad support from government line agencies.

8. There must be effective and efficient management and sufficient allocation of resources.

9. There should be a clearly defined work-plan with milestones and target dates and well established roles for drafting a strategy.

10. A broad communications program should be built into a strategy, including an information distribution system and mechanisms to promote cooperation and collaboration.

11. There should be regular briefings to interested ministers, the media and the public to inform them of the status of the strategy-development process.

12. A network of agencies developing strategies - locally, nationally and internationally - should be maintained.

13. To achieve a successful strategy every effort must be made to broaden "compartmentalized" planning.

14. The strategy, and the process for its development, must be cross-sectoral, inter-disciplinary, multi-departmental and cross-jurisdictional.

15. Public, industry and government participation should be included in the process from the start, with a sincere commitment to recognize and incorporate input.

16. Seek the involvement of a public working group as an effective way of getting public input early in the process.

17. A strategy should be designed, planned and completed, including an implementation and review process, within two years. To ensure that there is time, however, for proper consultations and to achieve an effective result with the full backing of all involved, the process should not be rushed.

18. The implementation plan should be a primary product of the strategy, detailing how to put it into practical action both inside and outside of government.

19. Establish how the strategy will be updated and who is responsible for follow-up and monitoring its implementation.

20. The political, social, economic and cultural context in which the conservation strategy is being developed must be recognized to take advantage of opportunities for promoting real change.

21. The strategy and the process for its development should be kept simple in order to be effective.

22. The broader issues - social and global - should be given full consideration.

23. Demonstration projects should be a part of a strategy to provide examples of means to achieve goals.

24. A workshop should be organized on the substance of conservation/sustainable development strategies.

PRESENTATIONS

MODERATOR'S PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Welcome to this conservation strategies workshop. My name is Leslie Whitby. I am the Director of the Sustainable Development Branch of Environment Canada. I am pleased to see so many of you here today to be part of the session. I think it is extremely exciting to see that conservation strategies have gained a lot of momentum in the last little while. It is our intention today to take this opportunity to learn from one another's experiences in the development of conservation strategies, or sustainable development strategies as some people are calling them.

We have with us today a distinguished group of panelists from various parts of the country who have been involved in one way or another in the development of conservation strategies. We asked these panelists to share their experiences in the process of developing conservation strategies so that we can learn from their successes and, sometimes, from their setbacks. We have asked each of these speakers to come forward with one or two key recommendations for making the development of a conservation strategy successful.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY

(Presented by Moderator: Dr. Leslie Whitby)

Introduction by Moderator

I would like to provide you with a few of the highlights of the Prince Edward Island Conservation Strategy on behalf of Kingsley Lewis* who is unable to be here today.

Across Canada and internationally, there is a growing avareness of the interdependence of economic development and environmental sensibility. The report of the United Nations Task Force known as the "Brundtland Commission" and Canada's Report on the National Task Force on Environment and Economy, established by the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM) are representative of that increasing understanding.

Prior to the formation of the National Task Force, however, Prince Edward Island undertook the preparation of the first conservation strategy in the country. The process began officially in the summer of 1986 with a directive from the Executive Council to prepare the strategy. A major milestone was reached in March of 1987 with its establishment as a formal document approved by the Executive Council and tabled in the Legislative Assembly. The preparation of the Provincial Conservation Strategy was undertaken through a process which saw the formation of several Committees made up of civil servants (both Provincial and Federal), representatives of environmental non-government organizations, academic institutions and private citizens. These Committees addressed the principal conservation issues confronting Prince Edward Island, including soil degradation and conservation, fish and wildlife management, water quality and pollution control, landscape protection, and coastal zone management.

Direction was provided through a Coordinating Committee and continuity through a common Secretary. The resulting Strategy contains approximately 50 major recommendations grouped under the following headings:

- Agriculture, forestry, transportation, fish and wildlife, the coastal zone, landscape and land-use planning and tourism, water management and pollution control, public awareness, volunteer groups and the role of government.

---

* Mr. Lewis currently holds two positions with the government of Prince Edward Island. As the Director of Provincial Planning in the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs he is responsible for the development of the Provincial Land Use Policy. He is also the Coordinator of the Provincial Conservation Strategy where he is responsible for the implementation of that Strategy (See Annex A).

The Provincial Conservation Strategy is an understandable step in the evolution of the process which began in a modern sense in the early seventies with the first Royal Commission on Land Use and Land Ownership. Legislatively, this was followed by the Planning Act of 1974, and the first Environmental Protection Act (also in 1974). The process owes a great deal to the efforts of non-government organizations and the media, both of which focused attention on environmental and conservation matters.

Prince Edward Island's economy is rooted in agriculture and forestry, the inshore fishery and aquaculture, tourism, food processing and services. Each of these economic engines is, in turn, dependent on a set of resources that comprise the Island's, land, water and air. The quality of these resources is the basis of the Province's future economic fortunes and, in addition, will help to shape its social, cultural and physical future well-being. It is little wonder therefore, that sustainable development emerged as the theme of the Provincial Conservation Strategy and plays an important role in the continuing efforts to improve the provincial economy.

The "mission" or goal of the Provincial Conservation Strategy is to ensure that the concept of sustainable development, through proper conservation measures and environmental management, is an ongoing part of the ordinary life of all Prince Edward Islanders. Operationally, this implies that the approach to implementation, in its governmental sense, places much of the responsibility for implementation on line departments and agencies. It also implies at other levels that there are very significant roles to be played by non-government organizations and the private sector.

To facilitate this, the government established a separate coordinating function with a small staff and a separate budget to promote implementation, identify linkages, assist community groups and non-government organizations and to provide for public information respecting sustainable development and conservation. In addition, an Environmental Advisory Council was established in mid-1987 to advise the Minister of Community and Cultural Affairs, whose Department is responsible for these matters. Unless it is not practical, a deliberate effort has been made to ensure that the work is carried out as a line function. The main exceptions to this are the fulfilling of the Secretary's role for the Environmental Advisory Council, administration of the Strategy's budget and direct assistance to non-government organizations and community groups in implementing projects under the Island Conservation Assistance Program.

Because much of the early work in implementing the Strategy has been process related, many of the benefits which will, we believe, result from this approach are intangible and long-term and are therefore difficult to measure in a quantitative way. Because the approach to implementation is through existing line departments and agencies, much of what has been accomplished is the result of these departments' and agencies' efforts as well as those of the environmental organizations and individuals who have contributed but are not necessarily directly part of the coordination effort.

In 1988, a report was produced that reviewed the initiatives which supported or assisted in implementing the Provincial Conservation Strategy. In support of its role to advise the Minister, the PEI Environmental Advisory Council produced a review of provincial progress on recommendations contained in the Strategy.

During the past year several initiatives have been undertaken that are in support of implementation. These include: the promulgation of a new Planning Act, the Environmental Protection Act and the Natural Areas Protection Act; establishment of the Royal Commission on Land Use and of the Island Conservation Assistance Program which make funds available to local projects; the signing of agreements such as the Forestry-Economic Regional Development Agreement; and the Canada/Prince Edward Island Memorandum of Understanding on Conservation and Development. The implementation of the Conservation Strategy has gotten off to a reasonably successful start, particularly if one accepts the fact that much of the early "process" work, difficult to evaluate in the initial stages, is leading to actual implementation now. While this does not in any way indicate that it is a time for complacency or that the next steps will be easier, with the continuation of the necessary commitment from government and the maintenance of the spirit of cooperation which has been evident throughout the whole process, the next stages of coordination and implementation of the strategy should be achievable.

ARCTIC MARINE CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Elizabeth Snider

Introduction by Moderator

Our next speaker is Liz Snider. She comes to us from **Fisheries and Oceans Canada**. She has worked for Indian and Northern Affairs and also for the Department of the Environment. She says that the theme running through her life has been Indian land claims. She is interested in conservation strategies because she feels that you cannot separate Indian land claims from the land itself.

Ruth McKechnie asked if I would come to this workshop to outline the Department of Fisheries and Ocean's (DFO) experience in coordinating the development of the Canadian Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy. I agreed because I felt there was a benefit for those agencies involved in the formulation of conservation strategies to not only understand the content of the strategies themselves, but also to share our experiences with the process of developing the strategy - to build on the successes and learn from the mistakes.

It is hard to believe that eight years have passed since Canada, as a nation, made a commitment to develop national, regional and local conservation strategies by endorsing the World Conservation Strategy (WCS). At that time many of those agencies undertaking regional conservation strategies anticipated that today we would be assessing the progress of implementation.

This, in itself, was the first lesson - the process takes time.

Northern conservation strategy planning was initiated, to a large degree, by the 1984 Task Force on Northern Conservation. In addition to the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy (AMCS), local and regional conservation strategies are under way in the Yukon, a sustainable development strategy is being developed by the NWT and the Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC) will undergo further review at their general assembly in Greenland this summer. In order to coordinate our work and build on our individual efforts, a Northern Conservation Strategy Working Group was established with membership from the two territorial governments, ICC, Indigenous Survival International, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, the Department of Environment (DOE), and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). This group has developed an Action Plan to guide our joint efforts.

This interaction has pointed out for me how important contact and sharing of information has been in the development of northern conservation strategies. This same experience, on a more informal basis, should be extended throughout Canada to avoid reinventing the wheel each time.

As for the Arctic marine area in particular, the World Conservation Strategy specifically identified the Arctic as a priority sea because the Arctic environment does not recover quickly from damage. At that time, the WCS objectives focused more on mitigation and prevention, to maintain the perceived pristine nature of the area.

We now know first hand how vulnerable the Arctic environment is, not only to local sources of pollution and degradation, but also to long-range contaminants which have affected the terrestrial and marine areas, the food chain, the climate and the atmosphere.

The Northern Task Force recommended to the Minister of Indian Affairs that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans assume its legitimate responsibility to lead in the development of an Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy for Canada. I am told that, at the time, it was expected that DFO would not accept the responsibility.

That is another lesson. These strategies can be undertaken by the most unlikely candidates.

Let me put this in a bit of perspective for you. At about the same time that the Task Force was making its recommendations, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans had organized a multi-sector workshop to develop an Arctic fisheries policy. At the last minute, involvement by DFO in the workshop was withdrawn without adequate time to advise other participants. The workshop carried on to develop some useful recommendations, but the events did not set the stage for future cooperation on other Arctic issues such as the strategy. This points out two very necessary elements in the development of a conservation strategy - cooperation and commitment of all involved agencies.

DFO, despite this track record, undertook the challenge to develop an Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy with a firm commitment. At the same time the voyage of the Polar Sea, and concerns over sovereignty also created a focus on the Arctic and highlighted the Government's concern over environmental issues, particularly with respect to the need for policy.

The Department, in assuming the lead, very clearly saw its role as a coordinator and advocate in the cooperative development of a comprehensive policy to conserve and manage the Arctic Ocean. The Department adopted a consensus-building approach to identifying issues, objectives and strategies.

In 1985 a Project Team was established within DFO with representation from headquarters and each regional office. In addition, a senior management steering committee was set up to guide the project's progress. To start, two issue-identification and planning workshops were held - one involving other agencies and the second involving only the Project Team. From these workshops a discussion guide with proposals for developing the conservation strategy and a synthesis paper outlining key issues were drafted.

A Program Committee comprising industry, native organizations, other government departments and non-government agencies was also set up to provide advice and assistance in early strategy development and in planning a consensus-building workshop.

The first question in developing a work-plan was the identification of who should be involved in the consensus-building process. The Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy Discussion Guide was mailed to approximately 80 organizations with an interest in the Arctic marine area. These organizations represented a cross-section of native groups, industry, other government departments, the territorial and provincial governments bordering on Arctic marine waters as well as non-government organizations and academia. On the basis of the responses to this initial contact, we established a core list of groups which continued to be involved throughout the process.

A consensus-building workshop was held in Yellowknife in October 1986 involving these various individuals and agencies. The workshop proved to be a breakthrough in the development of the conservation strategy. Attended by individuals representative of the different organizations in the core group, consensus was reached by participants on the purpose and 10 principles which still form the basis of the strategy. A preliminary Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy was drafted based on workshop recommendations and forwarded to workshop participants to review. To the degree possible with available DFO resources, informal contact was maintained with all the agencies involved.

The Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy Discussion Paper released for public comment in January 1988 was developed based on the full range of consultations. This document was reviewed twice within DFO Senior Management and continues to have the Department's full commitment. Formal consultations, through correspondence, meetings throughout the country, and with individuals or organizations have been conducted since the release of the Discussion Paper. A federal department steering committee was set up to coordinate federal input in the consultation. One of the most challenging tasks was experienced in determining how to best reach the various and widely dispersed native communities. DFO depended on the advice and assistance of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in conducting this side of the consultations. Work included a television broadcast in Inuktitut with the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation on Arctic marine conservation followed by an opportunity for northern residents to phone into the program with questions. In addition, a poster and essay contest seeking the young peoples' perceptions of Arctic marine conservation resulted in approximately 150 excellent, thoughtful entries.

These formal consultations have been concluded although we continue to meet with organizations and individuals on request. Comments on the Discussion Paper have been, on the whole, supportive. Work has begun to synthesize the comments and revise the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy as a policy proposal.

The primary concern with finalizing a Conservation Strategy is the implementation. Like other northern exercises such as Land Use Planning, the implementation depends, for a large part, on the good will of the parties involved and the availability of financial resources. In the case of the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy these are still unansvered questions. DFO has made major steps, from where it was five years ago, to meet the intent of the Strategy by reorganizing its Arctic activities and initiating a cooperative management approach to Departmental activities. This however is only a start and will continue to be an important consideration in the finalization of the Strategy.

Looking back on the process involved in the development of the Strategy itself, I offer the following.

1. The development of the Strategy should involve all sectors or interests even if, at first, this does not seem warranted. Government cannot develop and impose a conservation strategy on non-government agencies. If consensus cannot be reached on the basic principles then there is an underlying problem which should be resolved.

2. The process takes time if a consensus approach is adopted. There is no advantage in the long run to establish artificial deadlines.

3. There must be a commitment within the lead organization, in particular, but also within all agencies involved in the strategy and its implementation.

   At a second level, the commitment to developing a strategy must include the agencies' agreement to assign the task as a workload priority. For example, the AMCS could have been completed in less time but many delays in the strategy can be accounted for because other priorities or day-to-day activities took precedence. Any strategy development process requires at least one full-time dedicated staff plus part-time assistance.

4. Lastly, organizations developing conservation strategies should maintain communication with each other to provide advice and share experiences. This has been attempted by different agencies but has not been entirely successful. The mutual support provided by the Northern Conservation Strategies Working Group has been invaluable.

YUKON CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Dr. Tim McTiernan

Introduction by Moderator

Our next speaker is Dr. Timothy McTiernan, Director of Policy and Planning with the Department of Renewable Resources, Government of Yukon. Dr. McTiernan joined the Yukon government in 1981 to work on socio-economic issues related to the construction and operation of the proposed Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline. In 1984, he moved to his present position in the Department of Renewable Resources where he has been involved in work on northern conservation, renewable resource management, economic development and on strategic planning and policy development, as well as being involved in the negotiations of the Yukon Indian land claims. I thought his was the most interesting curriculum vitae I have ever seen because he spends his spare time as a psychology instructor and his specialty is in research related to stereotype and attitude formation and change, certainly something we are all going to need to think about while moving into sustainable development.

It has been argued in the World Conservation Strategy and throughout the world since, that the process of developing a conservation strategy is essentially a process involving fundamental changes in the way we think about environmental and economic issues and involves fundamental changes in the way we make decisions about economic development and about environmental protection and management. I think, in the Yukon, it has taken us a while to understand how fundamental the nature of the changes involved in developing and implementing conservation strategies are, and to what extent we have to change our thinking about resource management.

In developing the Yukon Conservation Strategy, we have had the strongest possible political support with our previous minister, with our current minister, with cabinet and with caucus. We have had the very best of technical advice and consultant help. I think we have also had the very best of intentions in terms of achieving a conservation strategy in a timely manner and in a manner that would be acceptable to all of the parties and all of the stakeholders involved in implementing and working with conversation strategies. It also seems, in the Yukon, that we have suffered all of the growing pains, and more, that can be suffered in the development of a conservation strategy.

Having worried about that for quite some time personally, and having worried about it collectively in the Department where we are responsible for coordinating work on the conservation strategy, we have begun to settle down and stay in for the long haul because, as Elizabeth has indicated just now, conservation strategies take time. They cannot be rushed, they cannot be forced by an ambitious agenda. In realizing that we have progressed from our early thinking about what it was we were doing through developing a conservation strategy and what it was that a conservation strategy might achieve for the

Territory. I spoke (as Elizabeth and others at the table have) a little over a year ago, at a Sustainable Development Conference in Vancouver on the topic of Northern Conservation Strategies. My perspective on the Yukon Conservation Strategy then is little different from my perspective on the Yukon Conservation Strategy now. Hopefully, if a conservation strategy is as strong a tool and as powerful an agent for change as it is supposed to be, our collective perspective inside and outside of government in the Yukon, on what a conservation strategy is, will be somewhat different a year from now. What I am going to do in the next few minutes, is offer you a very personal and probably a very idiosyncratic perspective on what has been involved in the development of the Yukon Conservation Strategy.

The Yukon Conservation Strategy document is currently in final draft. Shortly, it will be presented to our Minister of Renewable Resources for his review and for his direction regarding its presentation to Cabinet for approval. The development of the draft document, to-date, represents two different processes, each parallel to the other. One, is a formal process involved in drafting a document, consultation with stakeholders and interest groups and developing a promotional program and a set of demonstration projects to go with the conservation strategy. The other process, which is fundamentally important to what has happened in the last three years in the development of the Yukon Conservation Strategy, is somewhat more informal. It represents the thinking of government about the conservation strategy and its objectives; it has fundamentally changed over the past couple of years and that has affected the way in which government has worked with members of public interest groups in developing the strategy. I would like to talk about both processes today. But I think in order to understand both processes, it is perhaps worth mentioning a little of the history that provides a context and a backdrop to the development of the Yukon Conservation Strategy. The Conservation Strategy has been developed in a very rich context, involving a lot of debate and discussion over resource management, resource development and political autonomy in the Yukon.

In the early 1980's in the Yukon, there was a fairly intensive debate between the federal and territorial governments over who had control and responsibility for resource management and for development decisions. Resource management in that context was seen by the territorial government very much as a territorial imperative requiring a greater measure of local control; it was seen to be a part of a package of powers and responsibilities that would ultimately lead to greater autonomy and greater local control on the part of the territorial government in managing the activities of its residents and in managing the development of the Territory. In essence, the broader strategic issues regarding resource management in the territory were sources of debate and conflict with the federal government. When the federal government in the 1980's suggested work across the north on northern conservation issues, I think it is fair to say that the territorial government of the day had a very reserved if not a negative reaction to what was seen to be an Ottawa-based proposal. In the very early work on building consensus towards northern conservation issues, the territorial government stood to one side and argued that it could develop its own perspective based on local interests and local needs. Consequently, we did not participate formally in the Northern Conservation Strategy Workshop that was held in Whitehorse in 1983 which is in many respects the origin of a lot conservation work across Northern Canada today and it has already been spoken about with regards to the work of the Northern Conservation Task Force. When the Northern Conservation Task Force was established as a result of that 1983

workshop, however, the territorial government reassessed its views and participated in that forum, essentially to protect its management interests and to affirm that it was taking a responsible attitude towards resource management. This was an attitude that was important to project in a context of intensifying land claim negotiations in the North, both with the Inuivialuit of the Western Arctic and with the Yukon Indian people in Yukon as a whole.

In 1985 and 1986, with a change of government and a new minister in the Department of Renewable Resources, the Yukon government's focus on conservation issues became much more active, much more involved and conservation was seen to be an essential component of an overall sustainable development thrust that recognized the importance of: renewable resources to the economy of the Territory, particularly the economy of rural communities in the Territory; traditional harvesting activities for Indian people and for other people reliant on the land; and intensive renewable resource management, both to ensure orderly development of non-renewable resources in the Territory, particularly mining, and to ensure that the territorial economy was broadened, was more robust and less susceptible to boom and bust cycles. Consequently in 1985 and 1986 in the Territory, one had a plethora of activities all linked together, all working towards a more involved and more intensive management of resources and all oriented towards developing a more coherent and strategic perspective on the economic, resource and social future of the Territory. There were select Committee Hearings, chaired by our current Minister of Renewable Resources, on a green paper on the future of renewable resources and renewable resource management in the Territory. There was a multi-stakeholder and multi-faceted consultation program involved in developing Yukon 2000, the Yukon Economic Strategy. There were reactivated land claim talks with the Yukon Indian First Nations, with an emphasis on protecting the resource base that sustains the cultural lifestyle and activities of those First Nations. There was an intensified focus on public participation as a means of and as an important vehicle for policy development in the Territory. All of this moved towards a more strategic perspective on sustainable development in the Territory and on the conditions necessary for viable futures for our economy and for maintaining the lifestyle choices of our people.

The perspective that was sharpened in 1985 and 1986 was more economic than it was resource management in focus. But an embryo of conservation strategy thinking was emerging which was supported by the work of an inter-governmental Northern Conservation Working Group. The thinking had not yet evolved to an understanding that a conversation strategy was an essential component of an overall sustainable development strategy.

The focus on conservation was sharpened by two substantive issues which still remain in the Yukon. One was the debate over trapping and the fur industry. Trapping is a significant component of the Yukon economy and it is critical to maintaining the lifestyle and traditions and options for Indian people who live in rural communities. The Yukon government along with other groups and agencies participate actively in supporting the fur industry.

The Yukon government was also faced with a fundamental saw-off in terms of development versus environmental protection when the U.S. government entertained the possibility of allowing oil and gas drilling in the 10-02 lands in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) on the Alaskan North Slope. The 10-02 lands on the Coastal Plain and the ANWR Refuge are the core calving grounds of the Porcupine Caribou herd: a herd upon which several communities in the Western Arctic and Northern Yukon depend for food and for protein. The Yukon government has been active in lobbying against drilling in what is considered to be the key critical habitat in the entire range of the Porcupine Caribou herd.

As the Yukon government sharpened its knives on those issues in 1986, it also had the opportunity to participate in the World Conservation Strategy Conference in Ottawa and, as an observer, in the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in Kotzebue, Alaska. Both of those Conferences focused on the importance of conservation strategies as strategic tools for resource management and sustainable development. Coming out of Kotzebue, the Minister of Renewable Resources of the day was convinced that a conservation strategy was an essential management tool in the Territory and was, in essence, a resource management pillar to Yukon 2000 - the Yukon Economic Strategy. That decision was confirmed in Kotzebue airport with a brief discussion with a person who later worked with us very closely in the initial stages of the development of the Yukon Conservation Strategy, Robert Prescott-Allen who, as you know, was involved in drafting the World Conservation Strategy and has been involved in conservation strategy development work since.

Work formally started on the Yukon Conservation Strategy in the fall of 1986. Our focus, at that time, was on the timely production of a cabinet-approved strategy document. Informally, the underpinning assumptions were that the exercise was a technical one, refining integrated resource management and decision-making. Government would essentially set the agenda which, it assumed, would be supported by interest groups who had already participated in a wide variety of planning exercises through the economic strategy and the select committee hearings on renewable resources. We saw the conservation strategy, at that time, as reaffirming some of the traditional lifestyle issues we had been talking about in general on the fur question and the ANWR drilling question and we saw the implementation of the strategy as essentially one of implementing a more technical, more refined resource management regime.

A lot of credit goes to Robert and Christine Prescott-Allen, who were working with us at that time, for trying to shake us out of the notion that what we were involved in was a technical exercise. They underlined, emphasized and highlighted the need for consultation and building a constituency for the conservation strategy. Our counter-view was that we already had a constituency out there, that we needed to capitalize on it and we needed to capitalize on it quickly because we did not want to loose the momentum of the previous couple of years of work. We saw the conservation strategy as a product rather than as the product of a multi-stakeholder process. We saw the successful implementation of the strategy being dependent less on the collective commitment of the stakeholders than it did on the technical intellectual elegance of new policies, programs, legislation and regulations. Ultimately, however, we did accept the view that was offered to us by the people working with us on the conservation strategy. I am not sure that we fully understood it, but we accepted the need for public involvement in the development of the strategy document.

Consequently, in the spring of 1987 we worked to establish an ad hoc working group of resource users, business people and non-government organizations which has become known as the Public Working Group on the Yukon Conservation Strategy. As I said, firmly convinced that a lot of consultation had already been done and did not need to be repeated, we saw the exercise with the public working group as an extension of an on-going process. And we thought that the agenda to meet the rather ambitious schedule that we set ourselves for the development of the conservation strategy would be met by having the Public Working Group review a completed draft of the Yukon Conservation Strategy document. We proposed to incorporate the suggestions of the Public Working Group in a revision that would be presented to the Cabinet sometime in the fall of 1987.

The Public Working Group shared neither our sense of logic nor our sense of urgency. They argued strongly that while the conservation strategy might be anchored in work that was already under way and being completed, it was a separate and distinct process. As the stakeholders, they needed to be involved in that process from the start, not somewhere halfway down the road. At the same time that we were experiencing a clash in perspectives and expectations with the Public Working Group, we were also encountering some resistance within government to the development of the conservation strategy. The most fundamental resistance occurred often in our own department where there was some resentment on the part of program managers. Very understandably, from their perspective, dollars, time and human resources were being devoted to a strategy which might or might not have long-term benefits, when there were immediate and pressing research and management requirements which could do with more funding and which could do with more resources. There was also, I think it is fair to say, across Federal and Territorial government departments (not universally but certainly evident in many departments) a sense of indifference due to the perceived irrelevance of the strategy or due to the pressures of existing work loads - and dismissal, at least on the part of some working people in federal agencies in the Yukon, that the strategy was essentially irrelevant because it was a Yukon government tool and it did not apply more broadly than that.

The period from August 1987, when we were having our initial debates and discussions with the Public Working Group, to March 1988 was a period where we changed our focus on product to a focus on process. We spent a great deal of time clarifying roles, responsibilities and objectives of the Public Working Group, and in building involvement in government through a parallel Government Working Group on the Yukon Conservation Strategy. We were buoyed in our work by continued support from our minister, the caucus and our government leader who has become personally very involved in the sustainable development issue.

We were supported by the work of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy and the emphasis in that forum on conservation strategies. We were supported financially and technically by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in Ottawa which continues its commitment to northern conservation work. We were supported by the inter-governmental Northern Conservation Working Group. We were supported by continued lobbying on the fur and ANWR issues. At the same time, we were also being pressured by a growing staff commitment to the Yukon land claims process which seemed as if it might lead to a loss of impetus in continued efforts on the conservation strategy. It ultimately resulted in an opportunity which I think we have capitalized on and which I will speak of briefly.

Having consolidated our views on process, having backed away from an emphasis on product alone, we entered, in March 1988, what could be considered a third phase in the development of the Yukon Conversation Strategy: developing a product through a clearly defined and broadly based process. We started with a weekend workshop, which resulted in a framework paper which was later released as a discussion paper on the Yukon Conservation Strategy: a discussion paper developed jointly by the Public Working Group and government. It sets out a number of principles for the Yukon Conservation Strategy including: the Yukon's natural resources, renewable and non-renewable, and its cultural and heritage resources are to be addressed in the strategy; the ideas and knowledge that both aboriginal and non-native cultures have about the conservation of resources are to be recognized in the strategy; economic and environmental management go hand in hand; and decisions about the management of resources should reflect the need to integrate resource uses to the greatest extent possible. At this stage, the Department and the Public Working Group were working collaboratively. There was an emphasis on the task at hand rather than on power dynamics. There was some technical staff support for the Public Working Group. There was a fundamental change in thinking by government that we were in for the long haul and that a real product of the strategy was not a document but changes in decision-making processes. Between March 1988 and the fall of 1988 we produced the discussion paper that received Cabinet ratification. We broadened the public relations materials for the conservation strategy by producing promotional brochures, a logo, pins, and a series of informational handouts. We organized an on-going series of workshops, starting with a workshop on industrial codes of practice, following up with a workshop on environmental education. We will have a workshop on traditional aboriginal knowledge at the end of this month, one on recycling in June and the series will continue.

We also began to generate a list of demonstration projects and highlighted some projects that effectively demonstrate sustainable development in action. The Public Working Group members as well as government, began an intensive lobbying effort to broaden the base of support and to broaden the constituency for the conservation strategy.

The public discussion paper was released in the fall of 1988 and there were a series of briefings and consultations with community groups and interest groups over the winter. We have had some interesting feedback and some very basic feedback which draws you up short. A woman wrote in from Watson Lake saying "What's this talk about conservation, you're printing on one side of the page." She is right! Hopefully, the final strategy document will be printed on recycled paper. We are finding that there is difficulty in locating sources of recycled paper stock to print the final conservation strategy document.

The feedback served strongly to take us out of the clouds down to the ground on a number of issues. As the feedback was reviewed, it was incorporated into a re-draft of the conservation strategy document which emerged from a March 1989 workshop with the Public Working Group. As I said at the beginning, the document is in final draft. It lays out issues, objectives and strategic actions for each general conservation objective but also for each of the major business and industrial sectors in the Territories. The draft will be completed by month-end.

The government has already identified and voted on seed money for demonstration projects to illustrate sustainable development principles. We have one hundred thousand dollars in fiscal year 1989-1990 to support demonstration projects. There will be a continuing series of workshops. There will be additional projects related to the conservation strategy including, hopefully, a child's conservation strategy. Implementation mechanisms will be through land claims and other processes. The Yukon land claims agreements will provide for sustainable management of resources based on the principle of conservation. The strategy will be monitored by the Yukon Council on Environment and Economy. The strategy has been an election topic where all parties have supported its development.

I have a series of recommendations but I think that they all boil down to one point. The development of a conservation strategy has to be a collaborative effort between government and non-government organizations. One body or sector can not do it without the other. There needs to be support and commitment on both sides.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Jamie Bastedo

Introduction by Moderator

Jamie Bastedo is a senior policy analyst with the Department of Renewable Resources of the Northwest Territories government. He has been responsible for the management of wildlife, forests and promoting environmental quality and he has been extensively involved in the assessment of major development projects. Jamie has been in the Northwest Territories for the last five years. Before that, he taught Environmental Studies and he has spent time living and working in India.

I have some good news and bad. The bad news is that the Northwest Territories Conservation Strategy is dead and buried and the good news is that it has been resurrected as the NWT Sustainable Development Strategy. I should emphasize it was not simply a re-titling and re-labeling but it did go through a process of significant change and I will just try and document that briefly.

With all jurisdictions strategy development is a story line, and it has a beginning and hopefully an end. For us the beginning was in the winter of 1984 when the Northern Conservation Task Force Report was released. Liz and Tim have already spoken of it. One of the main recommendations was that a broad conservation policy be prepared and in the spring of the following year our Cabinet gave full endorsement to that document and directed the Department of Renewable Resources to take a lead in developing that policy.

Well a couple of years went by and they created a new person year and I arrived on the scene, so I can take some credit maybe for fathering this initiative, but by the spring of 1987 we had a basic framework for a conservation strategy. My in-basket had about three feet worth of black binders on Northern Conservation but no one could tell me what a Northern Conservation Strategy would look like.

We basically came up with a very simple framework: develop a conservation policy for the Northwest Territories government, an action plan for implementing that policy and call it the Northwest Territories Conservation Strategy.

During a major public workshop in the summer of 1987, the basic framework was endorsed and many of the principles and objectives of the policy were formulated. We received direction during that workshop to go forth and further refine this policy. We had a series of public workshops since then, Tim has already referred to the session in the winter of 1988 where we met in Vancouver of all places, to talk about northern conservation.

In the fall of 1988, we reached a general consensus among outside groups, such as Ecology North and some of the native groups, and within Government on a draft of the policy. We retitled this policy "Sustainable Development" in recognition of its broader scope. The main people involved in drafting this policy, oddly enough, were from an internal government working group. And I

suppose on a spectrum of public consultation to-date, the Northwest Territories would not be on the extreme public end. I personally believe that this consensus, which we reached through a series of public workshops and through land use planning workshops and other forums that we piggy backed on, is fairly significant because the common understanding and vision that is generated now within our own government is quite significant, when you compare it to where we were.

The review of the policy was completed over last winter and I have a press release here dated May 17th, which is today, announcing full Cabinet endorsement of the sustainable development policy, so we now have clear and unequivocal support, that key ingredient, from our leaders and we also have direction to proceed with a much wider public consultation process, with fixed deadlines and milestones.

I should not talk too much about the future because there are no lessons really to be learned about things we have not done.

Just to recap, in simple arithmetic this is what we are looking at now. Our policy, which has been endorsed in principle by the Cabinet, and an action plan which will be developed over the next few months, will constitute our Sustainable Development Strategy.

Towards a Northwest Territories Sustainable Development Policy: Draft Principles and Guidelines is a document where we spent a lot of time, not focusing so much on the definition of sustainable development, but dealing up front with the basic assumptions, principles and guidelines as to what it is pointing to. We came up with several guidelines that we all agreed to and that span not only ecological concepts of sustainability but also economic, social and cultural. These guidelines could be applied to any kind of project, whether it is a sawmill or uranium mine (that is a tricky one we are working on now) or a pipeline.

For instance, economic sustainability could be measured in terms of self-reliance at the local level. Does or does not a project foster this kind of self-reliance? Does it increase employment opportunities for the resident labour force through education, training and job creation, and maximize opportunities for the local retention and investment of profits and allow for control of the pace of development in promoting long-term resource benefits? These are some of the ways we have come to grips with this concept of sustainability. From a social and cultural point of view does a project or program: maintain and strengthen community values and identity; build a sense of meaningful participation and responsibility in project development and implementation; support and maintain traditional activities and relationships; and maintain or enhance heritage resources which we define as archaeological or historic resources?

For the ecological aspects we have just incorporated the three objectives of the World Conservation Strategy and in many ways ecological sustainability is self-evident.

I just want to focus on the strengths of our process, from my personal perspective. As an outcome of some of the workshops we have held, the roles and responsibilities within government and outside of government were fairly well

defined from the start. It may be that in the Northwest Territories people are "work-shopped" to death. There is land selection going on through land claims, there are four land use planning processes occurring, there are all kinds of workshops talking about economic development and so on. All these have been inter-linked. We received a clear message, "OK. you guys, we endorse these principles, we endorse the framework, you go and create something and come back to us." Well, there was a lot of time to do that and now we have come back. So in some sense that has helped the process along.

Another strength is that there is a new feeling of camaraderie and partnership within the Northwest Territories government and some of the old animosities have now been replaced with alliances. I think there has been a lot of lateral thinking going on through this process. The fact that we have switched over from conservation to sustainable development, I think, was a major bubble that burst and we realized that Brundtland and the Task Force are talking about more than conservation. They are talking about harmonizing conservation and development. So, it has definitely attracted more attention and endorsement having broadened the scope.

Perhaps the greatest weaknesses are the shortage of resources and manpower, but I do not think we will generate any sympathy on that note because it is something all our jurisdictions will share.

A work plan is something the bureaucrats are good at generating but I have to say, some kind of work plan is required: identification of major milestones and target dates, exactly when the next workshop will be held, when will we be generating what reports or what pieces of paper and when will we be focusing on community tours. We did not have a clear vision of where we wanted to go and how. This definitely was a bit of a hindrance. Other priorities and distractions always tend to "seep" in and steal you away from your project.

For us, in hindsight, we did not regularly brief all interested ministers within government, we did not regularly brief the media, more and more relying on press releases and interviews. I think what we had to do is generate excitement and enthusiasm and I am sure we could have done it better. So this is a self professed weakness of our process.

Lastly, lack of continuity and public involvement: in many ways it was a stochastic process, the faces often changed, the organizations would send different people to different workshops. This is a systemic problem in the Northwest Territories. I think the formation of a Public Working Group in the Yukon is an excellent model and something we regret we did not do sooner. It is likely in the stars for the next phase of our policy development.

Besides the formal products and formal process that I have described, there is some indication that the idea of sustainable development is making a lot of headway in the Northwest Territories. While we were working on this particular project, a special committee of MLA's were going around to the different communities discussing economic development in the Northwest Territories in a strategic sense much like the Yukon 2000 project. They have commissioned an independent study on sustainable development which is completely in line with the policy. The Lancaster Sound Regional Plan was completed a few months ago

and it was quite steeped in sustainable development objectives and builds demonstration projects right into it. I think no matter when this Policy and Action Plan are approved and no matter what it says there is now a fresh perspective on how development projects are revieved. There is more emphasis on long-term benefits and local self-reliance.

Getting to the recommendations: From our experience I think it is very important to focus on the assumptions, principles and guidelines for sustainable development up front, rather than cut-and-dried definitions of what exactly sustainable development is. We discovered fifteen definitions of conservation applied to northern Canada alone and I am currently up to eleven definitions of sustainable development. Our own simple definition is "sustainable development is a form of social and economic growth which harmonizes conservation and development goals". The point being that Brundtland was talking not about conservation alone but conservation and development. We found this to be a very positive way of generating consensus. Focus on your common ground and your assumptions.

Secondly, and this I think all of us are grappling with, we need to clarify the relationship between a "conservation strategy" and a "sustainable development strategy". We know what a sustainable development strategy is in the North, in our own terms. I understand that Manitoba for instance is also preparing a sustainable development strategy. They also are going ahead with a Prairie Conservation Strategy. It may be that conservation strategies are more sectoral, specific, and focusing on specific resources that need long term preservation. I do not have the answers.

Then, lastly, building a sense of partnership amongst all interest groups as soon as possible. We are learning that lesson the hard way, but our Cabinet now has the message loud and clear.

TOWARDS A CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR QUEBEC

Bertrand Tétreault

original presentation in French:
"Vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement"

Introduction by Moderator

Our next speaker, Bertrand Tétreault, will present Quebec's approach to the development of a conservation strategy. Mr. Tétreault joined the Quebec Department of Recreation, Fish and Game in 1969, where he held a number of positions. In 1979, he was appointed to the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Canada in Ottawa, but he later returned to the Quebec government as executive assistant to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Wildlife and the Outdoors. In 1981, he returned to Ottawa as Director General of the Canadian Wildife Service of Environment Canada, a position he held until 1985. For the following two years, he was Assistant Deputy Minister of Operations of the Quebec Environment Department. Since February of this year, he has served as Chairman of the Quebec "Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement".

I would like to begin by saying that, having worked for the last ten or fifteen years in operations, I do not pretend to be as qualified as you in the area of strategies and policies. I just recently began working in this area. Secondly, I would like to tell you about an incident that occurred just a few weeks ago at a reception held at the Department for my colleagues and I who were leaving operations. There were those who said to me, and I am translating "We have been to Vietnam together. We have had some pretty rough times. Now, we are both at the Pentagon. Looking back, what did we achieve? I hope we can concentrate and focus our energies on some benefits for our children."

The review I will present to you today was very informative for me, for it allowed me to take stock of what has been done in Quebec in terms of the development of the strategy, what is currently being done and what will be done in the future. The Council will need to complement the work of the Round Table on the Environment, which is preparing a plan of action parallel to the strategy. First, I would like to say a few words about the role of the "Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement du Québec" in the evolution of the idea of developing a conservation strategy in Quebec over the past five or ten years. If we look at the Council's latest annual activity reports, we see that discussions on the quality of life always come down to the constant improvement of the quality of the environment. In other words, the issue cannot be considered in isolation or treated on a case by case basis. In past reports, the Council has insisted each time on an environmental approach that encompasses both human and natural environments. Such an approach is essential and cannot be isolated or consigned to a single department of the government administrative apparatus. On the contrary, it requires consistency within a well defined framework. As a result, the Council, promoting this approach for the last five

years, has recommended that the implementation of an environmental policy must be "a government policy that would place the environment at the top of its list of priorities". It has added that the policy "must be the cornerstone of the national decision-making process" and in the case of Quebec, by national we must understand provincial.

The subject I wish to discuss with you today, is the result of efforts by the Advisory Council on the Environment, the forerunner of the "Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement", which was established in 1987. I asked the Council's former chairman to fill me in on how the entire consultation process worked, so that I could give you a clearer picture. Following the ninth meeting of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment in Quebec in October 1985, the recommendations made at this meeting and adopted by the Advisory Council at that time were submitted to the Environment Minister. The following recommendation was brought to his attention:

> "That a resolution be passed that the provincial governments be urged to implement provincial conservation strategies with the cooperation of their environmental advisory councils in order to promote consultation with the public. This public consultation seems essential for the development of a truly effective provincial conservation strategy."

This resolution, brought to the attention of the provincial and federal Environment Ministers, is our starting point. The response to the resolution was immediate and favourable. At a conference at the University of Montreal on March 1, 1986, the then Environment Minister, Clifford Lincoln, announced that the Council would be given the mandate of holding public consultations regarding the preparation of a conservation and development strategy. The Council was informed of this mandate in a letter from the Minister dated March 21, 1986. The Council decided to prepare a document, which was published in June 1988, after being reviewed by twenty Council members in 1986 and 1987.

In June 1988, after a review by specialists, the document, entitled "Vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement", was approved by the "Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement" and 4500 copies were distributed. It served as a reference for discussion and analysis, but more specifically, it served as food for thought for a large number of people involved in socio-economic, socio-cultural and environmental fields in all parts of Quebec. Consultations were held in November and December 1988 in Quebec's nine largest cities. All consultations were preceded by information sessions, which received tremendous coverage at the national and regional levels.

Owing to the large demand, additional sessions were required in Montreal, and the deadline for the submission of briefs was extended by fifteen days in order to give everyone the opportunity to express their views.

The Council received 155 briefs at the sixteen public hearings. Groups and individuals, associations, businesses and government and quasi-public organizations appeared before the Council's representatives. All hearings were chaired by my predecessor, Marcel Junius. He was assisted by several members of our organization. In addition, the Council recorded 45 briefs submitted by

groups or individuals by January 15, 1989. In all, 200 briefs were received, for a total of more than 4000 pages. Interpretation of these briefs involved assessing: the common perceptions of environment and conservation issues in general; the reaction to the Council's discussion paper; and the main ideas raised by those who submitted briefs.

With respect to the general issues discussed in the briefs, one of the key points raised by all interested parties was that the quality of the environment, which has already been degraded by over 100 years of industrialization, continues to deteriorate at a staggering pace.

Among the many environmental statutes and regulations in Quebec, the Environment Quality Act is particularly well appreciated. However, the interested parties indicated that it was not enough for the government to have a full arsenal of anti-pollution legislation if it were not applied in a rigorous and timely manner.

Again and again, we were told that the very first step toward a sound conservation strategy was the rigorous implementation of the Environment Quality Act.

As a corollary, the parties also signaled the lack of stringent government environmental requirements aimed at polluters and its excessive tolerance for those guilty of offenses regarding the discharge of industrial toxic substances and the use of pesticides, phytocides and other chemicals in agricultural, forest and urban environments. I must say that here in Quebec, we have made great strides in the past five or six months with regard to regulation in this area, in order to comply with the standards.

The interested parties also presented briefs on a large number of wide-ranging problems in a city in the heart of Quebec, such as the nuisances suffered in the past thirty years due to very high levels of air pollution in highly urbanized areas. The Council also heard complaints regarding the difficulty of protecting natural spaces and aquatic and wildlife habitats. Other issues raised included noise pollution, excessive energy consumption, the future of arable land, and the disposal and recycling of waste. In short, the entire list of environmental concerns was brought before the Council. The serious problems caused by the lack of a policy on bio-medical waste (on this point, I am pleased to report that an official policy on bio-medical waste was adopted last week) as well as those caused by the cumulative effects of various environmental contaminants on human health were also raised. On the other hand, it was unanimously agreed that nature's vast resources are a common good, and that all citizens, primarily the government, are responsible for their conservation. The parties also expressed the view that public health was closely linked to the quality of the environment and that openness was an indication of sound environmental management.

A few words now about the discussion paper that was distributed to the groups. This document, entitled "Vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement" was favourably received in all circles, and served as either a source of inspiration or a catalyst for various groups to submit their views to the Council.

Moving now to the comments from the groups on the various themes in the report. Although it appeared very clear to us that the council's document "vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement" was the source of themes and ideas, the major international principles put forth in the World Conservation Strategy did not appear to penetrate the various levels of society. However, the effect of the successive press conferences which preceded the public consultations was that they unveiled and demystified the global concept of the environment through the use of simple language.

In addition, a large number of participants expressed the view that the public needs to freely express its views before a committee composed of persons outside the government or of certain pressure groups. This point appeared to be of crucial importance.

It is heartening to observe that the idea of implementing a resource conservation strategy for sustainable development has been accepted and promoted by all interested parties without exception. It was recommended that we get down to it immediately.

The participants, who came from such diverse backgrounds as chambers of commerce and unions, demanded that the Department of the Environment adopt a well structured approach. They demanded heightened environmental awareness in all departments, government and private organizations, from the highest authority to the most modest citizen, to contribute to the protection of the environment in terms of the quality of life. The briefs also expressed a concern that a larger share of the decisions regarding the environment be taken by the level of government closest to the management of day-to-day activities, namely the municipal level.

The approach aimed at the conservation of resources with a view to achieving sustainable, consistent and equitable development for all, requires the introduction of a new vocabulary incorporated at all levels. This vocabulary links nature to the quality of the living environment and also recognizes that man is the creator and the creation of his environment. As a result, the quality of life and human health go hand in hand with the rational and harmonious use of our natural resources.

In brief, the message to my predecessor from the participants is as follows: "To achieve these objectives, we need a clear policy built on strong foundations. The Quebec government must set the tone. It will be supported by municipal associations, municipalities, unions, chambers of commerce, environmental groups, farmers, loggers, hunters, fishermen, city dwellers, professional corporations, in other words, all users of the environment."

The interested parties also stated that the improvement of the environment, both urban and rural, is contingent on accessible, understandable information which is to-the-point and provided in a timely manner. To give greater weight to their assertion, they demanded an amendment to the Environment Quality Act which would give corporations the same right as individuals to seek remedies.

In the months ahead, the Council will inform the Environment Minister of the initiatives taken as part of its mandate. The Council will issue a notice on the basic elements of a conservation and development strategy: the principles, general objectives and general measures.

For each basic element, we will assemble the key proposals made during the public consultations and then recommendations will be made by the Council following a review of these proposals.

The briefs submitted at the public consultations and the notice to be issued by the Council will constitute an important source of information for officials of the Department of the Environment, for organizations associated with the implementation of the conservation and development strategy and for the Quebec Round Table on Environment and Economy.

ALBERTA CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Mike Kelly

Introduction by Moderator

Our next speaker is Mike Kelly of the Environment Council of Alberta. Mr. Kelly worked for seven years at the Institute for Northern Studies in the areas of resource economics and sustainable resource use in northern Saskachevan. Since 1979, he has been involved with various environmental and economic issue areas as a Senior Research Officer with the Environment Council of Alberta in Edmonton. His current responsibilities include the coordination of the Alberta Conservation Strategy Project.

Mr. Kelly also served on the Secretariat to the National Task Force on Environment and Economy which has been a major impetus to the sustainable development movement in Canada.

To best understand the Alberta Conservation Strategy, you really have to understand a little bit about the Environment Council of Alberta (ECA). The ECA is a Crown Corporation established under its own legislation at arm's length from government. The Chief Executive Officer of the Environment Council reports directly to the Minister of Environment and does not go through the Department of Environment.

There is a Public Advisory Committee (PAC) to the Environment Council and its a group of about 200 people representing about a 140 organizations. These organizations include all the environmental groups as you might expect but, there are also representatives from every city in the province, from several chambers of commerce, each university and college in Alberta, several health related organizations and quite a large number of industrial associations like the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Canadian Coal Association, Electrical Utilities Planning Council, Energy Resources Conservation Board and others. So it is quite a diverse group. Those members are divided into eight subcommittees, each with terms of reference that are very clearly spelled out in a Roles Document and these various committees conduct in total about sixty or seventy meetings annually at the ECA.

So this is a fairly sophisticated and organized institution that has been around for a while. The Alberta Conservation Strategy is only one of hundreds of agenda items. However, the Alberta Conservation Strategy is by far the largest, most difficult, most comprehensive and proactive project the Public Advisory Committee has ever undertaken. The Alberta Conservation Strategy (ACS) has been a standing agenda item often dominating the agenda of these subcommittees for four years now. The perseverance and steady support for this project is alone quite an achievement for people that are used to dealing with so many diverse issues.

PAC's agenda stretches from indigenous plant revegetation of railway lines and wetlands drainage, to toxic waste disposal, parks in urban areas, game ranching, fisheries management, etc. Economic matters are normally viewed as a standard component of environmental issues with PAC and that is largely due to the participation of the chambers of commerce and industrial associations.

The Alberta Conservation Strategy (ACS) project was launched in early 1985 with just three people from PAC forming a Steering Committee. I was assigned (very part time) to assist them. From that three person group came a small brochure entitled "What in the World is a Conservation Strategy", and that title has really proved to be apt ever since. (I think Tim and I are the last two fighting a rear guard action in keeping the words Conservation Strategy alive as opposed to changing it to a Sustainable Development Strategy, but I think I am going to go on record today as surrendering too.) The Steering Committee of that group swelled to twelve very quickly once the brochure was published and it had at least one member from each of the subcommittees that I mentioned earlier.

The next step is that we prepared a document entitled "A Prospectus for an Alberta Conservation Strategy". The paper went through four major reviews by PAC (those two hundred people I have referred to) and it was unanimously supported along with a call for public hearings on the Strategy. This took place at the Annual Joint Meeting with all the members of PAC in December of 1985. At that point (over three years ago), many felt that we could have a draft strategy within a year or maybe six months, and I think maybe we could have done that. But the members of the Steering Committee had a better idea. They were all familiar with the "dusty shelf syndrome" that seems to afflict so many fine environmental reports.

Their concern was that an Alberta Conservation Strategy prepared by them in 1986, would simply sit on the shelf and accomplish very little and I think they were right. What they decided to do to prevent that from happening, was to expand the project, since PAC itself was very keen, and in so doing make the exercise more action oriented. They saw the Strategy as an opportunity to build a larger framework for the hundreds of people and hundreds of issues that PAC dealt with. It has worked very much that way.

The project was divided into 12 portions initially, and later into 20. Background papers were to be prepared for each. There were Terms of Reference established based on a common Table of Contents for each of these twelve diverse areas. Those Terms of Reference emphasized two things: first, the sustainability of the resource or sector under consideration, and second, the interactions of that sector with all others. These two topics were to comprise half or more of each sector report. We wanted to avoid simply another paper on forestry because the important thing we were getting at was, how does forestry relate with fisheries management and any number of other things that go on in the forest. Each member of the Steering Committee then volunteered to look after the preparation of a sector report and each rode off in search of help.

Dozens of letters were sent to Ministers, the Premier, and senior public servants. The response was very positive by elected officials, and has been to this day, but it has varied within the civil service from cautiously helpful to cautiously indifferent. Nothing like this, it seemed, had ever been done

before. Here were all these citizens who apparently decided to launch a sweeping study into dozens of issue areas related to not only the environment, but to the economy as well. Their focus was inter-sectoral and anticipatory.

One of the major problems in the early days was simple credibility in trying to do this job. The Environment Council itself had moderate credibility with the public service, but fairly strong credibility with the public at large. This was largely due to the staff reports that we produce and our public hearings process and the overall success of the recommendations that came from those hearings. This was a PAC project from the beginning. PAC was still seen by many as a rather biased and not altogether friendly group of rabble-rousers. This latter impression was not accurate as of 1986, but in its earlier incarnations PAC had stepped very hard on many toes, and you all know, the public service tends to have a long institutional memory. The question of credibility was addressed in many ways, but largely by inviting the people who know the most to attend seminars, workshops, and meetings of PAC to share their expertise.

Over the last three years, over three hundred invited guest experts have shared their knowledge with PAC pertaining to the Alberta Conservation Strategy. As it turned out (we did not plan it this way), about one hundred of these experts came from the provincial Public Service (from fifteen different agencies) with another one hundred from the private sector (industry and consultants). The third hundred were academics and municipal and federal government agency people along with elected officials. So there was an interesting balance when we tallied them all up. These meetings (and the manner in which the information gained from them was used) have, in my opinion increased the credibility of PAC.

Nine of these papers, are now completed and published. More importantly, another seven are in the final stages of review. Three are now in the hands of industry for their final decisions and only one is still in preliminary form. All of the papers have been subject to extensive reviews, usually going through several iterations of revisions, review, etc., before finally being edited and published. These twenty reports constitute the baseline information from which the Alberta Conservation Strategy is now beginning to flow.

At the moment, our draft Conservation Strategy is out for its second review. The draft Strategy will form part of a package we are going to put together that will include a paper with over 400 suggestions for implementing the Alberta Conservation Strategy. The working title of it is "Approaches to Implementing the Alberta Conservation Strategy" (not very catchy but I hope we can improve on that). In addition we will distribute a compendium of practical ideas that everyone can do. Simple things that families and households and people pursuing recreational activities can do entitled "What I Can do for the Environment". We are trying to build a package that has something interesting in it for everyone.

The structure of the Strategy itself goes something like this: A vision statement that everyone can agree upon. Next, a series of six objectives, the first three based on the original World Conservation Strategy and three more added to suit the particular conditions in Alberta. The three we added cover energy resources, recreational and cultural needs and the quality of life in urban areas. Under each objective, we established more specific aims. I suppose they are similar to the policy statements that Jamie referred to. We ended up with 44 of those aims under the six objectives.

These aims were developed by the Steering Committee and then sent to every Ministry, the Premier, the opposition parties and PAC for comments. We incorporated as many of their comments as possible in the final version but now it is still in final draft version, so I am sure there are going to be changes yet to come. At this point, after the aims had been established, the structure moves from goals to action, and some additional requirements were considered to be necessary. As you all know, one of the problems with sustainable development is that it is difficult to measure. In fact this is probably the limiting factor to the appeal of sustainable development as a concept. Though we recognized that determining precise indicators for sustainable development is not a job for PAC, we wanted at least to ensure our suggestions were not going to move us away from sustainable development. So we needed some criteria and, to follow our own precepts, we had to make our criteria explicit and open for all to review.

What we chose to do was to establish certain prerequisites for each approach in order for it to qualify - to ensure, in other words, that none of the approaches would move us away from sustainable development. Each approach must of course be directed towards achieving one of the aims. More important, each approach must not contravene any one of the ten principles of sustainable development that we came up with. I will not go over them now. The idea is not that each approach must somehow realize each principle in its fullness, but that no approach actively contravene the principles. Finally, all these approaches are based on a hierarchy of policy instruments, the policy instruments being: (1) information and educational approaches; (2) incentives and disincentives both financial and otherwise; and, (3) regulations and enforcement.

At the moment, we do not have a great deal of consensus on the four hundred approaches. They remain just suggestions but we do not expect to develop any further consensus in any event. The plan is to take this decision structure to the public with the four hundred approaches in a set of public hearings. There may be some other public involvement processes in order to refine these issues, but this remains to be seen. Personally, I hope there will be. The nature of the Environment Council's hearings, and the mandate that is required from Cabinet to hold those hearings, vary enough so that I really cannot say how it will work out in the end. But the package we are preparing, I think, is going to be flexible enough to just move wherever the powers-that-be may want to direct the project as a whole.

The future of the project remains somewhat uncertain. This package of materials is the route we chose to go rather than to put all our eggs in one draft Strategy basket, because there are many things that are going to be controversial when it actually comes to implementing a conservation or sustainable development strategy.

All along through this process, we have maintained contact with people who are interested in our project and that has been a very important component of the overall process.

We send out our newsletter four times a year and we now have over three thousand names on the mailing list. Many of these names are actually editors of other newsletters, or interest groups of various sorts. So we have often had articles in our newsletters reprinted in other newsletters and many of those newsletters have a much wider mailing system than we do. Some of them as many as thirty thousand. So the reach in terms of our communication is much wider than you might think, although three thousand in the province of Alberta is not bad for starters.

What can be learned from all this? First, that there is a near tidal wave of support for putting together some kind of a framework within which environment and environmental issues can be better understood. People are terribly concerned but feel that nobody has an adequate handle on the problem. No one seems to be approaching the multiple issues of the environment from an integrated perspective. When they find out somebody is trying, in the form of a conservation strategy, they are really excited about this idea. The support and volunteer effort behind the ACS project that I have been working on, just never ceases to amaze me and continues even after four years to build and grow larger.

Second, we have learned that a strategic approach demands cooperation among many agencies of government. This is a major hurdle, but virtually every agency is now much more receptive and proactive in interdepartmental approaches than they were even two years ago. We do not pretend to take any credit for this, only note it as part of the convergence of thinking that seems to be occurring.

Third, keep it simple. We have struggled throughout this project to keep it simple without great success. The problems one encounters in looking at sustainable development are many and complex. So are the usual responses to these problems. Only after going through an awful lot of complexity does one begin to see some simplicity and I think there are some common things emerging that you have heard from the other speakers as well. Others may have been quicker to learn than we have been. Trying to keep things simple from the start will really help.

I have two additional recommendations. One is, do not forget the regional and municipal levels of government. These are the places closest to the public pulse and things here affect people first. People working at the regional and local levels are invaluable when it comes to developing any kind of a successful public participation program.

The last one is that I would like to see a working session of individuals who are directly involved with preparing these sustainable strategies. I do not just mean lecturing each other as we are doing right now, or even a question period, but spending two days locked up in a room sharing the kind of experiences and knowledge that we each have and we need from each other.

COMMENTS ON THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Diane Griffin

Introduction by Moderator

Diane Griffin, with the Prince Edward Island Nature Trust, is also a member of the National Round Table, the Prince Edward Island Round Table and a member of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council as well.

One thing that Kingsley Lewis would have wanted me to mention is that the Strategy's senior author was John McClellan, assisted by an eight person committee.

Three years ago, amidst a provincial election, two of us from the conservation groups went to all three party leaders and in the heat of the campaign, got written commitments that, if elected, each of them was committed to producing a conservation strategy for Prince Edward Island. I do not think they knew the full implication of what they were saying, but they committed themselves and that is all that it took. We did not let the winner forget it after. In fact, we had both ends working towards the middle. The grassroots environmentalists and the political will of the politicians working against a very nervous civil service. The nervous civil service has come on stream. Now the interesting thing about this fast track record was at that point the Minister Gilbert Clements, who is also the chairman of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers at the moment, said "Now that we are committed to a provincial conservation strategy, I am appointing you eight people to sit on this committee and I want the strategy by the time the Legislature opens next year." So we thought, "Oh Boy! Are we in trouble", but we took the fast track without complaint for two reasons. First of all, we thought we may never get another opportunity like this. "There is no provincial conservation strategy anywhere right now in Canada so let's do it. Maybe then Alberta and the others will come along with us." Having just left Alberta four months before I could say that.

Secondly, "strike the iron while it is hot" was our modus operandi with the idea that, what Robert Prescott-Allen calls, a first generation conservation strategy would keep on evolving. It was not the last word, it would become more sophisticated later and a lot of things have happened in the meantime. Primarily what is on-going, is that there has been a Round Table on Environment and Economy appointed as there has been in many other provinces. There is a Royal Commission on Land Use that is addressing a lot of issues. At the governmental level the Deputy Ministers have formed a committee in which they address the environmental and economic implications of the decisions being made in all their Departments. So, Mr. Prescott-Allen, the first generation is evolving and it is still growing.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

STATUS OF WORLD CONSERVATION STRATEGY II AND COMMENTS ON PROCESS

Robert Prescott-Allen

Introduction by Moderator

The next speaker is Robert Prescott-Allen. He was a moving force in getting people on-side with this whole idea of conservation strategies. He has asked for five minutes to add a few points to what has already been said.

I was responsible for drafting and negotiating the World Conservation Strategy. If I had been the sole author, things would have been much easier. Of course, it would not have had any effect.

It is unfortunate that the sponsoring agencies of the World Conservation Strategy made no provisions for promoting the Strategy, for monitoring and evaluating its results, nor for learning the lessons of people trying to implement it. We will try and do better this time.

As a result of that, the 54 conservation strategies that are going on in 41 countries around the world including those that are going on here in Canada, are going on in a complete vacuum, with virtually no exchange of experience - certainly no meaningful exchange of experience at all.

To try and correct that I am at the moment in the final stages of negotiating a project with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature to set up a database on conservation and sustainable development strategies which would make information available on the status of strategies, how they were prepared, what they have achieved and the particular features of each strategy. I think in the meanwhile, Mike Kelly's suggestion of a two day workshop of people actively engaged in conservation strategies to get together and really work out what the lessons are, so far, would be immensely valuable.

I would just like to say a few words about the new World Conservation Strategy and what I also feel are some of the lessons to be learned about national and sub-national strategies, so that we draw upon some of the experience of those other 54 strategies. I have to say that in the absence of a formal monitoring system and the absence at the moment of a conservation strategy database, all I can rely upon are my own contacts with people around the world. Given Canadian mail and the overworked bureaucracies, non-governmental as well as governmental, the information is not always that up-to-date.

However, the World Conservation Strategy is nov 10 years old in terms of the time when we first began to prepare it. Meanwhile, there have been large advances conceptually in what the scope and nature of the problem is and hov it might be addressed, advances represented by the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development and a good deal of national activities around the world. Those advances in thinking and ideas need to be reflected in an on-going fashion. So it has always been intended to revise and rewrite the World Conservation Strategy at some time.

In addition, although certain documents - such as the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) report - help us to think about the problem a great deal, they have not been very specific about the key actions that must be taken. So the kinds of documents we need now at the strategic level should reflect advances in thinking and at the same time be much more specific and helpful than the World Conservation Strategy was. Although, the WCED report has been advising countries and people within countries on what to do, particularly on the very difficult but crucial questions of cross-sectoral coordination and integration of conservation and development.

So that is the aim of the rewrite of the World Conservation Strategy. It has begun, it will be a two year process of several drafts with a very wide review, indeed, in which I hope that all of you here will participate. If I have an address list of every participant, I will guarantee that you will receive drafts of the strategy as it progresses and your active participation in its development I seek and ask now, please. The first draft is going to be an extremely rough document because I have to finish it by the early part of August. It will then go out for review for the rest of the year and we will work on the second draft between January and May of 1990. This again will be widely reviewed culminating in a formal review of the General Assembly in the fall of 1990. It will be revised a third time and the published document will be produced sometime in 1991; in time for the fun and games in 1992.

Jamie Bastedo mentioned the title. We have learned one lesson from the World Conservation Strategy and that is, the expanded definition that we used of conservation does not work. People outside the conservation movement think of conservation in terms of jelly, jam and fruit (you put it in bottles) or in terms of energy (you do not use it) or in terms of art and cultural artifacts (you protect it from the ravages of time). We have recognized that, we have conceded defeat and we realize that you cannot use the word conservation to mean in effect conservation plus development. There has to be some other word. These strategies that we are doing are about combining conservation and development and therefore they need a different kind of title. At the moment, we are using sustainable development but we recognize that in itself is not a satisfactory term because ecological sustainability is not the only principle we are concerned about. We are also concerned about social equity, economic viability, sensitivity to cultural diversity and so on. We may not come up with a better term than "sustainable development". At the moment we say "it does not really matter, we are not going to call it anything". So, it is just a Second World Conservation Strategy Project, and we hope that somebody, somewhere down the line, will have a bright idea and sacrifice it on the altar of universality and comprehensibility.

I think that there are five characteristics of a successful national, or provincial or territorial strategy.

1) The first, is that its preparation and implementation must be by a partnership of government and the public. If it is going to work, all parties must be fully involved. The national, provincial or territorial strategy should be a government policy statement and not a public advisory statement. The Cabinet should be committed to its implementation. The government should lead its preparation, but the result should be commitments to action by business and all interest groups and other non-government organizations as well as by government and it should be prepared jointly by government and the public rather than by government in-house and put out to public consultation.

2) The second principle is well planned and adequately funded organization.

Conservation strategies are a three part process:

- The first part, is the one where most of us are, the start-up, which goes on until somebody actually commits money and people to do the job of preparing the strategy.

- The second part, is preparation, which is where the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Alberta and the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy are. As far as I can tell nobody else. This is the point between the formal start-up and the point at which a document that sums the process of the preparation is adopted by all parties including government.

- The third part, and PEI is the only one that is in the third phase, is the implementation phase, where the recommended actions and the agreed-to actions, are taken. People say glibly that it is not the product that matters but it is the process, and that is nonsense. The product is the actions; the product is the improvements in human welfare and in environmental protection and combining conservation and development. That is the product. That is the fundamental thing and that is why we are in the business of doing strategies. The process is important because unless you have a well designed process you are obviously not going to achieve the product. Part of that, is having a document.

So I will say, to go back again, that the second ingredient of a good strategy is a well funded and planned organization to manage the process. Unless it is well funded and planned, then the thing will drift, lose momentum, people will loose confidence and interest and it will wind up doing nothing and being abandoned or just being dissipated. I fear that is what happens with strategies in which the preparation process takes longer than two years. If your organization is well planned and well funded it does not matter how complex your society is, preparing the strategy would take no more than two years.

3) The third key characteristic is that the strategy document, or group of documents should consist of at least four things.

   - One is the evaluation of the socioeconomic contributions of the area's resources and environment. So then people have agreed-to information on what sectors get out of which parts of the environment and how important those sectors are and how important those bits of the environment are. This is needed so that all participants see clearly how and to what extend each sector benefits from the area's natural resources and environment.

   - You need an assessment of the main resource management issues in the area showing the measures required to develop and conserve the area's resources and environment for all interest groups including opportunities and obstacles to combining conservation and development.

   - You need a cross-sectoral policy which says how all the different parties will combine development and conservation and coordinate sectors in the most cost-effective way.

   - Finally, you require an action plan setting out how governmental and non-governmental agencies will translate the strategy and policy into results. They should identify the strategic directions and priority actions that should be taken by government agencies, business, non-government organizations and local communities. So that the actions are not taken just by government, they are taken by all parties.

4) The fourth characteristic, that is key I think, is a consultation program to ensure that the strategy builds and reflects a consensus of all interests on the objectives of sustainable development, on the desired development and conservation products of the strategy and on what needs to be done to achieve them. It should also ensure the greatest opportunities for all participants to be part of implementing the strategy, by enabling them to contribute substantively to it and by giving them a stake in the strategy's outcome.

5) And finally, I think, every successful strategy has demonstration projects to show the meaning and feasibility of sustainable development in practical terms and I was delighted to hear from Tim McTiernan that the Yukon Conservation Strategy has a specific budgetary provision for demonstration projects. Most people, including us, have great difficulty grasping unfamiliar abstractions like sustainable development. Demonstration projects are the most effective way of providing tangible, real life demonstrations, particularly when it comes to combining conservation and development, integrating sectors, and that kind of thing.

OPEN DISCUSSION

First Question/Comment and Discussion

Wayne Neily of the Manitoba Environmental Council. I very much enjoyed hearing all of this. I have been following the processes over the years. I am a little disappointed to hear Mike Kelly say that he is giving up on the name "Conservation Strategy" and to hear Mr. Allen's comments that there is not a general acceptance of the broad definition of that. As you probably know, we have in Manitoba, sort of a unilateral decision to go ahead with the Sustainable Development Strategy as the name of it for this province and that does not make all of us happy by any means. Certainly, the name, some people say, is not of any significance. I do not agree with that myself because I think the perception of the strategy by the public is very closely linked to the name and if it is going to be only about development, whether sustainable or not, then sustainable development strategy would be appropriate. Surely it has to consider more than that, it has to consider the aspects of conservation that are not directly related to development and the aspects of every day living which are not usually considered as part of development. I do not have any solutions. I know "conservation strategy" is not by itself fully acceptable. Perhaps we should adopt the title similar to that used in the Quebec document, which if I remember correctly was "Vers une Stratégie pour la conservation et le développement". I would just like to hear some comments on that.

Mike Kelly:

I have used the word surrender. That is probably a bit of an exaggeration. I am sure that the words "conservation strategy" will be clearly reflected in our final document. Unlike Jamie, we from the beginning, took the idea of conservation strategy, as in fact, meaning a sustainable development strategy. The rear guard action, I was referring to was a semantic one just to maintain the links with the other things that are going on in the rest of the world and throughout the rest of the country. So, I do not feel as if were giving up anything at all because if you look at the 20 sectors that we are involved with, this is a sustainable development strategy. I do agree with you to some extent that conservation and preservation can be lost in it, but I think it has to be featured within each of the sectors in our particular case.

Tim McTiernan:

I would like to add a comment to that too. We have had the good fortune of having an Economic Strategy in place before we finished the Conservation Strategy. That Economic Strategy is based on principles of sustainable development and pays close attention to conservation requirements that are needed in order to ensure sustainable development in the renewable resource sector in the territory, particularly in the tourism sector. Our Conservation Strategy then, mirrors the Economic Strategy in speaking to sustainable development, but brings out the principles, some of the issues and highlights and some of the resource management requirements that are necessary to sustain ecosystems and habitat, to sustain our resource base and to ensure adequate environmental protection.

There has been a lot of discussion in the Yukon on the use of the term conservation strategy and I think throughout the process of that discussion, the notion of conservation has taken on that broad sustainable development connotation. One of the difficulties, as the leading edge of thinking changes about these issues, is that public recognition of changes in thinking and public acceptance of changes in thinking lags behind. If we start changing names in midstream, we have a much more complex public educational process to be involved in I think. I am beginning to believe that the thought process is evolutionary. You can assist it with an enriched environment but there is a certain sequence in changing thought patterns that has to be gone through, and that takes time.

Wayne Neily:

I just wanted to mention that the idea in particular that I was proposing is that both concepts be included in the title: that it be called for example, "a conservation and sustainable development strategy." If the process was good enough, perhaps everyone would accept the broader concept of conservation but it would require a major educational process (more for urban residents, I think, than rural ones). But it is the combined title that I was looking for some reaction to.

Jamie Bastedo:

From the Northwest Territories perspective, the political and economic climate is such that to talk about environmental protection and preservation, and so on, without talking about economic benefits... the two processes go hand in hand. For instance, both the Inuit and the Dene, Metis land claims had provisions for impact/benefit agreements and these would apply to the establishment of parks and potentially to development projects - mines and pipelines. While hearing about environmental protection, they want to hear about maximum benefits. It is a very, very underdeveloped economy and the extent of support has been expanded so much in broadening our own policy work so, we have got our mandate: it has to be that balanced conservation and development, hand in hand, into the future type of idea.

Just for people's interest there is a book called "Sustainable Development - Exploring the Contradictions." You may have heard about it. It deals with the whole problem of sustainable development being a bit of an oxymoron.

Second Question/Comment and Discussion

I am Gary Gallon of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment with the Minister's office. Jim Bradley was a member of the National Task Force and, I guess has established now a Round Table. Rick Findlay, the Executive Director of the Round Table is here today. We stole him from Environment Canada. But my question is in regard to the definition of sustainable development, what I am hearing here today and what I have seen in Ontario, is basically the death knell of a conservation strategy.

We can not even push it in Ontario. People think it is jam and that it is a museum approach to life. The Indians do not want it up in the Northwest Territories and the industrialists do not want it in Ontario. In effect, many of us who want it and who mourn its demise can no longer use it effectively and that takes us to sustainable development. If you take a close look at the concept, sustainability gets the adjective but development gets the noun. So in effect, the noun is the stronger and the pro development people out there are in some respects trying to distort sustainable development. We have seen that with a high level member of the National Task Force in Ontario, a member of the industrial sector when we imposed in Ontario a new pollution control program for air. He wrote a letter to the Minister and said, "Listen, I was on a Sustainable Development Task Force, you are promoting it, you are now ruining the sustainability of our industry."

So in effect that person is taking with him, and the industry is taking with it, the sustainability of the industry to live long and healthy and well, as sustainable development.

I know Robert Prescott-Allen. I was in Kenya in 1979 when Robert came to town to try and deal with the United Nations Environment Program and the pro-development people there from the Third World. He had quite a heated debate with one fellow who at that point was saying "we want development, we want conservation out of this". That debate ten years later today in Canada, is just the same.

My question is then, "what is sustainable development? How are we going to use it?" Because for Ontario, to move towards it, we have to start all over again in redefining it. One of our first tasks that we gave to the Round Table is not to define it because it takes too long and it is too broad. But in effect, we are going to have to find some kind of direction to go towards in this new sustainable direction game.

Mike Kelly:

Measurement indicators are what it is all about. If we kept the conservation strategy title, we would still be faced with this same problem. It is really now developing measurement instruments of various kinds. That is the direction we are moving with the Alberta Strategy. It is a very difficult one and we always end up in this crunch no matter what we call it. And that is where we are right now.

Third Question/Comment

My name is Kenneth Emberly of the Crossroad Resource Group here in Winnipeg. I would like to ask a question. How many people here today would hold up their hands and are here as a non-government and non-business representative? About five or six.

I am very intrigued with two things: the length of time it is going to take and how it is going to be done. I understand we have a two year deadline to change the whole world and turn around and start going backwards. Or start going forwards in a different direction. We have two years to get it done. It has got to be done in two years.

The other thing I am concerned with is, I sure like the quality of the people sitting at the front table. They are intelligent and very lucid in what they have to say and I would love to see those words written on those boards exactly put into the proceedings without a single word being changed not even the grammar. Usually when they get it through the proceedings it has been improved, corrected, altered and adjusted so it comes out as a jumble of platitudes and parables that do not mean anything.

I am very concerned, Madam Chairman, that the very best use be made of a gathering like this and just think if this man from the World Conservation Strategy and some non-governmnent organizations had been involved in the planning and designing of this conference and had been able to extend it for two days for a workshop of all the people that wanted to come and if scholarships had been available to the people that do not have business and government funding so that non-government organizations could have come to the meeting.

What I am really concerned about is: we hear in physics that there is an equal and opposite reaction a balance, a pendulum. How many people have heard talk about a pendulum? Well since about sixteen hundred we have been swinging the pendulum one way. Business and economics always comes first and the environment always comes last. Now Ms. Brundtland says, abrupt drastic change, so what we are going to do is keep the pendulum going round in a circle, but it is going to wobble a little bit.

Nobody is talking about the fact that if we are going to save this planet, we have to correct the imbalance, not fiddle with it. So for maybe twenty five or thirty years, the environment comes first. Only the environment comes first. Every single project must fit in and complement natural systems and not destroy them and must not destroy people or then the project is shut down. The project cannot proceed. The second that starts to happen you will get thousands of new businesses created and you will get more jobs created than are created now and they will not destroy the environment. There is no need to worry about the economy the second we start putting the environment first. And I see no emphasis on that.

Fourth Question/Comment

My name is Jim Irwin. I represent a very small organization that we hope some day will be very large. It is called the World Biosphere Centre and it is a concept that tries to draw all the human resources that we have working on this planet to a central focus and to direct this information at the public and share this information among the people that are involved with the effort towards world sustainability or, I should say I suppose, just sustainable development. Also a key point in this is the well-being of mankind. Just to speed things up so I do not ramble, I will read the purpose that we have come up with. Some of the philosophy is in the basic terms of reference. This is in a conceptual state and certainly there is a limited amount of brain power that has gone in at this point.

The World Biosphere Centre concept would be to establish and maintain an altruistic, unifying, collaborating, coordinating, innovating network of human resources to facilitate the development of technology and the modification of resource management and socioeconomic systems which would allow the world to develop and grow economically in a way which is compatible with resource sustainability and the life sustaining potential of the biosphere in order to optimize the long-term quality of human life on our planet.

The philosophy of the World Biosphere Centre is a unique altruistic, independent, international, non-governmental, non-profit organization which respects all races, cultures, creeds and lives of all sovereign nations and of all human life which functions in the highest level of integrity.

I guess the question is that I see a common need that is brought up here to form some sort of unifying body which can meet the objectives that are seen as being a problem in trying to integrate the whole system.

Fifth Question/Comment and Discussion

Madam Chairman, Steven Kensey from the Land Conservation Council of New South Wales. I look at the twelve recommendations up there and say: "Australia went through all of that in 1981, 1982, and 1983". We came up with a marvelous thing called a National Conservation Strategy for Australia which was endorsed at the Prime Ministerial level and by the Leader of the Opposition. It was endorsed at the level of each state government by each Premier and each Leader of the Opposition. No sooner had the ink dried on the production that came out from the Australian Government Publication Service, it was a dead letter. Now, that was despite the fact that the final document was after 2 1/2 years of public consultation drawn up at a conference that had close to two hundred people there representing non-government organizations, environmental organizations, industrial groups, commodity producer councils, governments, academia, industry and interested groups as well.

Now the reason it failed, notwithstanding the very democratic and open process which was used to devise it, was that it appeared to not be legitimated by whatever it is that legitimates things in the Australian political process. How are you proposing, to legitimate your respective strategies throughout the provinces of Canada and also at the national level as well?

Tim McTiernan:

I think one of the things, and Robert Prescott-Allen has mentioned it, and other people have mentioned it today already, is that there needs to be a monitoring and a follow-up process. It has become very clear to us in our work on the conservation strategy and other related work, that implementation plans are as important as the conservation strategy itself. We hope to have (indeed it has been announced by the current government) the Yukon Council on Environment and Economy, once it is established as our Round Table on Environment and Economy, monitor the implementation of both the economic strategy and the conservation strategy. It will produce periodic reports on the implementation.

One of the options that our Minister and Cabinet will be considering in the draft of the conservation strategy is a call for all government departments, federal and territorial, to develop their implementation or action plans as to how they are going to deal with the conservation strategy. And we will be encouraging non-government organizations and business and industry groups to do the same thing. That is a successful ploy that the National Task Force and Environment and Economy took. It (the Task Force) fingered people and said we want to see what you do, and we are going to look at it in a year's time and see how well you have done. This leads to interesting shuffling to meet the deadlines and the targets.

We need to disperse responsibility across different agencies. I have heard already in the last day or two the notion of environmental ghettos and "ghettoization" of processes. The strategies should not be "ghettoized". Responsibility should be dispersed but not diffused. It is easy to diffuse responsibility: to figure that somebody else will take control or manage the process. You need to disperse responsibility but ensure it is not diffused.

And I think (and this is a personal perspective) that in developing a conservation strategy you have to think comprehensively and holistically. In implementing it you have to see strategic opportunities and there are many of those out there, and it involves a great deal of creative thinking, but you anchor the strategy and the implementation of actions to processes that are already under way, that are related, that have momentum.

Leslie Whitby:

I think that a lot of the speakers covered the political system in their speeches. Federally, we will have to consult with about 25 to 35 different government organizations. We are in the process of setting up that structure now and we have every intention of taking it through our Cabinet structure to the Prime Minister. But it will not be something that is just Environment Canada's product, it will be a federal government product and it will be something that we are all committed to implementing.

Elizabeth Snider:

I think that we have to take one step further, and this is what we have been trying to encourage in doing the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy. We have talked about developing conservation strategies, we have talked about developing implementation plans, but what really counts is the actions that are actually taken. I think that in developing federal strategies, whether they be solely under federal jurisdiction or shared responsibility, that it is incumbent on the federal government departments to take the first actions, and actually set an example. We have set up a Steering Committee with all the federal departments, not only that have responsibility for the Arctic area, but have responsibility for the financial side of things with the government and for policy development, to make those actions come about as the first step.

Diane Griffin:

To legitimize any process within a state or province, one needs acceptance at the top levels. In Prince Edward Island, the Cabinet accepted the document and then tabled it in the Legislature which made it a public document. Immediately, all departments were asked to review the document and indicate how they intended to fit their program into this, what was their action plan. I think that is really important, it is not one department, all have to buy into it.

Mike Kelly:

I just wanted to use this opportunity to agree with Robert Prescott-Allen's first recommendation that government really needs to take a lead role here. Since our strategies are largely produced by non-government groups, we have been trying to figure out for years now how best to hand off or at least share this football with the agencies of government. But as you pointed out earlier Leslie, the role of the public service is not to lead: it is to get instruction and then do well with what they have been instructed to do. It really has to be the Legislature who says "OK all you guys! We have to do these things and were going to have these measurements and indicators attached to it, so that these things will be done by such and such a date." That is the only way to legitimize the process.

Sixth Question/Comment and Discussion

Jean-Yves Cayen from the Canadian Parks Service. We are just in the process now of focusing or re-focusing our attention on trying to see how we fit into sustainable development. (It was "environment-economy integration" before. I hope the word does not keep on changing because we will have to re-orient our resources and spend a lot of time doing so.)

One of the projects we are planning to undertake is participating in the departmental initiative on the federal conservation strategy, the national one or both. One of the things we have noticed internally is the fact that people, as ironic as it may seem, are somewhat uncomfortable with conservation strategies, especially in the context of sustainable development. There is probably a legitimate concern that when we use the concept of sustainable development, development takes over and we have to then show how heritage conservation and protected areas of management or agencies have to fit into this new mold.

I would like to get some feedback from the panel on what their experience has been, through the process of developing their own conservation strategies, with how heritage conservation and protected area organizations have seen their role in this process, what their position is vis-a-vis conservation strategies and sustainable development strategies and if whether or not the public has reacted to this - what has been the impression?

Mike Kelly:

One of the sector papers we are proudest of is entitled "Dinosaurs and Distant Drums". Its about both the natural and human heritage resources of the province. Once we had decided we were going to do that, marshaling support has been no problem. There is a lot of support for that sort of thing in the conservation strategy or sustainable development strategy.

Jamie Bastedo:

From the NWT perspective, we built conservation areas right into the policy, the Sustainable Development Policy. It is one of the four main areas that it will be focusing on, along with integration of resource management and things like that. We have some principles as to how these areas should be established and managed and they emphasize things like identifying impacts and benefits of parks before they are established. These kind of things I have talked about earlier, as well as promoting applied research and monitoring in those areas which can in turn lead to better management of resources both in the park or whatever, and the surrounding regions with similar types of environments. We are trying to promote them as a balance to the resource management tools that have their own inherent impacts and benefits.

Diane Griffin:

In PEI, the heritage groups were active participants in drafting the strategy and the recommendations were integrated into the strategy and are now coming forward again in the Royal Commission on Land Use and will come out of those hearings again, so it was a great opportunity to entrench a lot of very important concepts.

Tim McTiernan:

Heritage groups were involved in the Yukon Conservation Strategy. They argued strongly for the heritage perspective which will be reflected in the final strategy document. Protected areas seem to be key in the protection of critical habitat and ecosystems. Protected areas will be provided for in resource management regimes in the Yukon down the road, possibly through land claim agreements with First Nations.

Elizabeth Snider:

Protected areas are also part of the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy and heritage people were involved in that section.

Seventh Question/Comment and Discussion

My name is Phil Sanderson. I am from Vancouver. I am an economic development official for the Municipality of Burnaby and we are right now in the process of preparing an economic development strategy for the municipality. One of the reasons I am here, of course, is to try to prepare a strategy that incorporates principles of sustainable development or sustainable economic development or whatever we hopefully will decide the catch phrase will be. My question is directed towards Mike Kelly, and I think one of his points was very well taken. That is, when you are preparing a conservation strategy, at a regional or provincial level its very important to include the local level of government because in many situations, you are going to find that it is at the local level where many of the action plans are going to be implemented towards sustainable development.

I am a member of the Economic Development Association of B.C., of which there is a counterpart in Alberta. I am also a member of the Industrial Developers Association of Canada and I am just wondering in your experience, Mike or any of the other panelists, to what extent their strategy preparations have involved provincial or national or local economic development officials.

Mike Kelly:

Well, just speaking for Alberta, the Industrial Associations have been quite involved. If I am reading your question correctly, I suppose we can always use a lot more economic development type of people involved in what it is we are doing, but we do the best we can with what we have. Most of the people who are practitioners in any of the particular sectors that we are involved with, have jobs in those sectors and so they are looking out for the economic interests as well.

Maybe a broader point about looking at the municipal and regional areas, we have not done much of that yet in Alberta but I think we are going to be able to move in that direction in the relatively near future, building on a program from Municipal Affairs in Alberta called: "Vision 2020". I think that there is room for moving conservation strategies to the regional and local level in Alberta which I think will be where the action is, that is where it is going to be most important.

Bertrand Tétreault:

From looking at the list here on the Quebec side, I see that some of the representations from Forestry Associations, the Mining Association of Quebec, the Tourism Association of Quebec, Unions, the Metallurgical Federation, the Agricultural side, Noranda, the Order of Architects, etc., etc., so the viewpoints of these groups have been expressed quite strongly in the consultation process.

Jamie Bastedo:

I heard last night Rick Findlay of the Ontario Round Table talking about the possibility of setting up Round Tables at the municipal and regional level.

Elizabeth Snider:

In the strategy work that we did, we actually talked to industry from the larger level like the Oil and Gas Industry, the Mining Industry, and the Hydro Electric Industry but also Economic Development Officers in the communities like Iqualuit, Yellowknife and Inuvik.

Diane Griffin:

In Prince Edward Island all of the major industries had representatives involved. Where we were weak, was communicating with the municipalities and that will be something that will be brought along a little later as the Strategy continues to evolve.

Eighth Question/Comment and Discussion

My name is Chris Winter. I am with the Conservation Council of Ontario. I had always understood that the Australian Conservation Strategy was one of the world leaders and I am a little disappointed to hear that Australia is doing so badly, but I am not at all surprised. I think we can learn a lot from the Australian experience because we are making a lot of the same mistakes here in Canada. If a strategy fails I think it is for a number of reasons. One is that there are no guts to it - that is basically the bottom line. If there are no guts to a strategy, then there are no hard core dates or targets or figures that we say we are going to meet, no objectives that we set for ourselves and there is no relation to the existing programs and activities which are really in effect the existing strategy. Because whether or not we have it written down and packaged in a little binder with a ribbon around it, every province or territory and country has a strategy of some kind, it is the sum total of all the programs and activities that are pro-development, pro-conservation, mix of both, whatever.

So, unless we start addressing the existing strategy that is in place at the moment, then what we are doing, which is just coming from the top from general first principles and working our way down, is not going to have any impact. When we get to the stage where we have got a set of objectives and we meet up with the existing strategy (that big dinosaur that we all stand back from and say we recognize the problems) there should be fireworks. If there are no fireworks we have not done our job. I think at the moment we have, given what I have seen in some of the material presented today, the type of strategy that does not create fireworks, it does not have guts to it. We have seen something very heavy on public consultation, cooperation, on everyone buying in and working together, which is all fine and good we do need that, but when it comes down to the bottom line I will gladly trade a pound of consultation for an ounce of guts.

Mike Kelly:

Yes! You are going to love our approaches paper, with the 400 approaches I suggested before. They have time lines and they attribute responsibility, the whole works! That is why we are having such difficulties with it. That is why we are not going to go for general consensus before we distribute it.

Ninth Question/Comment and Discussion

I am Bill Rees and I just have a quick question to anyone who chooses to answer it. I want to put a global context on the discussion we have had this morning. We live in a world in which the atmosphere is undergoing very significant change, more so than in the last almost 260,000 years. This poses a significant potential threat to climate change and food production. Deforestation is taking place around the world. Desertification is a major problem, more land is going out of production in parts of Africa and Asia than is now coming into production. The world food production per capita has fallen something like 14% since 1985. Ozone depletion is another problem most of us are familiar with, at some level or other, acid rain etc., etc. All of these problems indicate, of course, changes in the global environment, all of them are due to development as we understand it. What I am curious to know is, since all of these problems (in fact some of them individually and certainly all of them collectively) pose a real threat to the survival of civilization as we know it within the next 50 years or so, what do any of the concepts that we have discussed this morning really contribute (since all of them are talking about more of the same in effect) to a sustainable global environment?

What I am really saying is, all I have heard this morning is that sustainable development means more development. We may have better impact statements, we may have somewhat better environmental regulations, but certainly in the foreseeable future it is going to be based on an extension of our current technologies, our continued use, in fact massively increased use, of fossil fuels and so and on so forth.

Since we are already in a state of threats and clear indications that there is already too much of that kind of development, what are we really talking about here?

Tim McTiernan:

Sustainable development does not necessarily always means development at all cost to all people. Our government is on record as opposing two development proposals: the proposal to drill for oil and gas on 10-02 Lands and ANWR, which I mentioned earlier. It has also made an intervention at the National Energy Board hearings on gas export from the MacKenzie Delta, saying it is opposed to a pipeline across the North Yukon, regardless of benefits. So there are bottom lines that need to be addressed.

Bill Rees:

Is it opposed to the use of the gas?

Tim McTiernan:

No, of course not!

Bill Rees:

Well, since that is a fossil fuel that would only contribute to the continued deterioration of the atmosphere, why not? What difference does it make where the pipeline goes, that is a trivial impact relative to the use of fossil fuel.

Tim McTiernan:

Can you provide me with the substitute in the next twenty years?

Bill Rees:

No, I cannot, but the point is, if we continue to use fossil fuels, at the accelerated rate projected by industry, you will not need a substitute at the end of twenty years.

Tim McTiernan:

No, I understand the dilemma. I think one thing that strategy development does, whatever you call them, is begin to change people's thinking about issues, and it begins to change their acceptance of what is and is not an acceptable lifestyle and what is and is not an acceptable cost for that lifestyle.

Bill Rees:

But, let me just make a suggestion then about changed thinking. Canadians consume 2½ times per capita as much energy as Europeans at a comparable standard of living. Conservation would eliminate the need to develop any of our frontier oil and gas reserves in the foreseeable future.

Tim McTiernan:

Are you saying do we agree with that or not?

Bill Rees:

I am just saying that if you want change in thinking, that is a real change in thinking. Look, Canadians put 9 billion dollars of subsidy into the development of the Beaufort Sea. We are now on the verge of exporting the whole caboodle to the United States for about 11 billion dollars. So, we have an ironic situation of Canadians subsidizing cheap energy for the U.S. consumer and it happens to be in fact the form of fossil fuel energy which is the most ecologically benign. Now this is asinine policy anyway you look at it, from the environmental point of view, from an economic development point of view, from a conservation point of view. But that is what we are doing, and the present government continues in that policy of fossil fuel subsidy for the benefit of, say, American consumers. Now if you want a change in thinking, let's get down to some basics here and not talk about location of the pipeline. That is almost irrelevant in the context that we are dealing with, it seems to me.

Diane Griffin:

One of the main things we found that came out of the conservation strategy was the search for appropriate development. In other words, mega-projects are not for Prince Edward Island and they never were. It has given the Premier a stronger hand in that way.

One interesting development is that the Premier has a group of people looking at the global situation. That really boggles my mind: Prince Edward Island, the smallest province, has a group of people studying the global situation and what impact it can have on that. I am interested to see what comes out of that.

Jamie Bastedo:

One strong theme that has come out of our consultation is that our work so far has focused on the developer, the producer, and production. More emphasis needs to be put on the consumer. I think some of the stuff we heard from Mike this morning may lead the way to incorporating that at an individual household level, that is really where it is at.

Mike Kelly:

Four very quick points. First of all I agree with your analysis of the problem. Second, in the Alberta Conservation Strategy we are making a very important distinction between growth and development and we try to define those as clearly as we can. Third, one of your earlier projections as to which direction we are going reminded me of the humorous saying which I think is also accurate, that is, that the shortest distance between two errors is a straight line projection. Fourth, sustainable development is not the "be all and end all". It is not going to usher in Utopia, but I think it is a step in the right direction. What we are looking for is alternatives - what is better. That is a responsibility we all have. If we do not like sustainable development then the question is "what is better and how can we either build it into that concept or develop a different one?"

MODERATOR'S CLOSING REMARKS

I would like to close now. I think the debate is going to continue and I do not think we are going to find any easy answers to all the problems that are facing us. I would like to thank the panelists, particularly those who stepped in at the last minute to help us. I would like to thank you for your participation.

This is not the end of it. We are going to put together the Proceedings and get them out to you. I think the idea that Mike had on the workshop on the substance of what these strategies are and something on how we change attitudes are critical to the next few years and I think we will try very hard to make that happen.

Thank you very much for coming this morning.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CONSERVATION STRATEGY
by Kingsley Lewis

The purpose of this paper is to briefly describe the process through which the Prince Edward Island Conservation Strategy was developed and, in broad terms, some of the experiences which have been encountered to date in its implementation. The paper is divided into four sections. The first outlines some key elements of the background to Prince Edward Island to provide an understanding of the context in which the Conservation Strategy was prepared. The second, also contextual, is a brief discussion of environment and economy linkages within the Province. The third is devoted to the strategy itself in terms of its development, its content, its implementation and some challenges which are foreseen in the immediate future. The paper concludes with some broad recommendations respecting approaches to the development of conservation strategies, or other strategic planning processes generally.

Background

In order to understand how it was possible within Prince Edward Island to develop a Conservation Strategy in a short time it may be helpful to begin by saying a few things about the population of the Province, its physiography and land use.

In 1988 the population of Prince Edward Island stood at approximately 128,000 people. This small population is swelled during the tourist season by the addition of approximately 720,000 tourists or other visitors. Although the population remains predominately rural it is important to note that the distribution of the population has changed quite dramatically over the past number of decades. A review of the current population distribution in the Province reveals that it is about 35% urban and 65% rural. It is noteworthy that the rural population has changed quite dramatically in recent times. Presently only 8% of the population is classified as rural-farm with approximately 57% being rural non-farm.

Physiographically Prince Edward Island is approximately 140 miles long and ranges in width from approximately 2 to 40 miles. Its surficial geology is sandy to clay soil underlain by fractured sandstone and siltstone. It contains approximately 1,100 miles of generally eroding coastline, some 850 miles of which are salt water exposed. It has an unusually rich resource lying in 240 miles of Class I and II beaches. These beaches constitute approximately 60% of the total Class I and II beaches in the Maritime Provinces.

In terms of land use the Province, which contains approximately 1.4 million acres, and, contrary to what may be envisioned as a result of media exposure with respect to Prince Edward Island, about 1/2 is wooded with about 30% being in various types of cropland. The balance is made up of wetlands, marginally arable land and urban development.

Environment-Economy Linkages

Prince Edward Island is rooted economically in agriculture (including forestry), the inshore fishery (including aquaculture), and tourism. Most of its manufacturing is linked to processing of the products which are either grown or caught by Islanders. The province's gross domestic product (i.e. excluding federal transfers) was approximately 1.22 billion dollars in 1988. It is estimated that between 1/4 and 1/3 of this is directly related to the relatively high quality of the physical environment. Of the 62,000 jobs in the Province between 1/3 and 1/2 are dependent on a high quality environment as well.

Socio-culturally the Province is strongly linked to the land. Anyone who knows the history of the Province will know that its initial subdivision was into 67 lots with the ownership of these (with two exceptions) being decided by a simple lottery held in England. This resulted in a land-holding pattern strongly influenced by absentee owners and tenant farmers. The Island's struggle to break this stranglehold raged for over 100 years. This issue remains current and, it is fair to say, Prince Edward Island governments have had a direct legislative involvement in the matter of land-ownership for over 100 years. This strong tie to the land is evident as well in the very strong recreational component based on land which exists in the Province including activities such as cottaging, sport fishing, hunting, boating, beaching and various passive activities.

In summary it can be said that Prince Edward Island, more so than most Provinces, is heavily tied in terms of its economic health to the quality of its environment and, in particular, its land base.

Conservation Strategy Development

The preparation of the Provincial Conservation Strategy, as a document, took about nine months to complete.

In order to understand how this was possible, not only is it necessary to understand the Province's long concern over land and land use matters, which stretches over the life of its modern settlement, it's also necessary to look at a series of events and processes which made it possible for all of this to happen.

The key precursors were:

a) In 1969 the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan was signed. This fifteen year plan, amongst other things, created within the Provincial civil service a technical capability with respect to environment, including the Province's first Department of the Environment. This was, in turn, preceded by the Environmental Control Commission. In effect, during this period, the technical "infrastructure" was created.

b) In 1972 the first Royal Commission on Land Use and Land Ownership reported. The Commission's report, because its focus was broader than simply regulation, gave rise to much expanded land use planning as a Provincial function.

c) In 1974 the Province created a new Planning Act which gave a land use regulation mandate to the Province and Municipalities as well as regional planning boards and continued the Land Use Commission which had been created in 1972.

d) Also in 1974 the Province's first Environmental Protection Act was created. This gave the Province a broadened mandate in Environment.

e) In 1982 the Land Protection Act was proclaimed and gave an expanded mandate to the Province to deal with the issues of the size of land holdings and tenure.

f) In 1983 a new Municipalities Act was created which enabled Municipalities to exercise a broader mandate in some environmental questions.

In addition to these happenings or undertakings on the part of governments a set of factors surrounds or was created by the activity of non-government organizations. Organizations such as the Island Nature Trust, the Natural History Society, HOPE (Help Our Provincial Environment) and various wildlife federations all gave focus to environmental protection issues from the perspective in which they are most effective, that is non-partisan political lobbying and public awareness.

Finally the role of the media in focusing attention on environmental matters, needs to be noted. The role of the media has been very positive in focusing on the importance and fragility of the environment. The down side of this has been the attention which has focused on major events, particularly disasters. This focus on point sources of pollution has had one unfortunate side effect. It has meant that many of the most serious problems which face Prince Edward Island, and probably the Country, such as soil degradation and so on have not been given the same profile as others.

It would be easy, and perhaps even plausible, to say that the process of development of the Conservation Strategy began with a directive from Executive Council to do so. This would, however, ignore one important factor. During the election campaign of 1986 a group of individuals representing non-government organizations approached all three political parties with a proposition to prepare a conservation strategy if elected. All three parties responded positively and this set of circumstances, provided post-election action was taken, created a "no lose" situation.

It is to the credit of the Government that it acted quickly on its campaign promise through a Cabinet directive to prepare a Conservation Strategy. In the summer of 1986 a Coordinating Committee was appointed. The Committee consisted of a Chairman (the Executive Director of the Land Use Commission), four persons representing non-government organizations, one federal civil servant, a knowledgeable private citizen and two provincial civil servants, one with wide ranging ties within the environment community and who acted as secretary.

In order to respond as quickly as Government wished, it made sense to draw on existing expertise. During the fall and winter of 1986 and 1987, sector groups were formed in agriculture, water and wildlife management, coastal zone management, water quality and pollution control, and landscape and land use.

These sector groups were made up of cross sections of Provincial and Federal civil servants, representatives of non-government organizations, and some private citizens. The objective was to do the job quickly. This was achieved.

A summary of the contributing factors to making the Conservation Strategy happen quickly is as follows:

a) there was the political will to do so;

b) there was the professional will to do so;

c) because the major problems were understood reasonably well no new major studies were undertaken and existing information was used;

d) the scope of the strategy was limited to a focus on activities which would be government driven;

e) past working relationships facilitated ease of movement amongst government departments;

f) media attention on environment continued at a high level. This was in contrast to the profile of the strategy development process which was low except within government circles.

In April 1987 the Strategy was completed, approved by Executive Council and tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

Conservation Strategy Content

The Conservation Strategy contains line function chapters on agriculture, forestry, transportation, fish and wildlife, coastal zone, water management and pollution control and landscape, land use planning and tourism. This approach was used because it flowed naturally from the interests and perspectives of those who worked on the Strategy.

The Strategy also contains other chapters which relate to non-line functions including the need for education and public awareness, a strategy involving volunteer groups (non-government organizations) and the role of the provincial government.

Conservation Strategy Implementation

Once adopted the attention focused on implementation. The Conservation Strategy itself outlines some initial steps. In terms of Provincial government commitment the recommendations to adopt the Strategy as policy, release it to the public and appoint a coordinator were carried forward. At a later stage an action plan for implementation was developed as well.

With respect to the ongoing provincial role, the strategy had recommended funding for coordination and allocations on a departmental basis. The funding for coordination was provided for in a separate budget and various activities have led to the establishment of funding mechanisms within some line departments.

The strategy also outlined a need to enable the establishment of environmental management and planning. Efforts in this regard were pursued including the establishment of the Canada-PEI Memorandum of Understanding on Conservation and Development, an unfunded agreement among five Provincial and six Federal departments or agencies, designed to ensure programs and projects among federal/provincial governments and the private sector are sustainable. Implementation of this MOU is through a coordinating committee representative of the parties and co-chaired by the Deputy Minister of Community and Cultural Affairs (which has the lead role in environmental protection) and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) which has the mandate for renegotiating the Canada-PEI Economic Regional Development Agreements (ERDA's).

The opportunity for the Province to lead the way through increased efforts to develop Crown lands policy is recognized in the Conservation Strategy. Even though, in comparison to other jurisdictions in Canada, the Province has a small proportion of the land base within the Crown lands category this represents an opportunity to lead by example, particularly since Crown land is spread across the Province.

A third group of implementation steps falls under the general heading of non-government organizations' role. The strategy recommends continuing support of non-government organizations by the Province through a combination of funding and staff support. The call for organized projects has been responded to by the creation of an Island Conservation Assistance Program (ICAP) to fund local conservation efforts, generally in concert with federally funded projects. In the first year there were nine of these, in the second eighteen and the prospects for the current year would indicate about the same level. The response to the strategy's proposal to create a Provincial Conservation Council has been by way of re-establishing the Environmental Advisory Council enabled by the Environmental Protection Act of 1974 and carried forward in the new 1988 Act. The Environmental Advisory Council, in addition to its responsibilities to advise the Minister on matters which he refers to it under the Act, has become a defacto "watchdog" on Conservation Strategy progress. The Council's first report to the Minister was tabled in the House a short time ago. More recently government established its Round Table on Environment and Economy.

The Conservation Strategy identifies a need for a comprehensive action plan to be developed. In order to do so, the focus for implementation which an overall objective or mission statement would provide needed to be developed. In the final analysis it was agreed that the overall objective of the Conservation Strategy should be "to establish sustainable development as a part of the ordinary life of the Province as evidenced by the actions of governments, non-government organizations, the private sector and the public at large". The main implications of this broad statement are threefold. First the objective is to promote the concept of sustainable development as ordinary and ongoing and present in the activities of all of the groups mentioned. This is the marked contrast to a concept which would see the establishment of a "super agency" which would assume the responsibility for establishing sustainable development in the Province. We believe that our approach will bear more fruit over time. Second, the use of the phraseology "sustainable development" is a refinement which indicates that the general posture of the strategy is not one which is

anti-development. On the contrary it is pro-development provided the requirement of the development being sustainable has been met. Third, this objective "bells the cat" in terms of being able to measure the activities of the groups mentioned over time to give some idea of whether or not progress is actually being made.

The need for coordination remained. This implied the need to set up a small, independently funded group to assume responsibility for promoting, coordinating and monitoring progress in implementing the strategy and reporting on this on an annual basis. Initially this coordination function was operationalized through a joint appointment with the Executive Director of the Land Use Commission who had been responsible for chairing the original coordinating committee. Subsequently this was changed to a joint appointment with that of Director of Provincial Planning, a new position created under the 1988 Planning Act to operationalize the Province's enablement to develop province-wide land use and development policy.

Given the mission statement set for the Conservation Strategy implementation the coordinating function has been largely geared to assisting others to undertake the various tasks identified. The exceptions to this have been that the Coordination Office, (consisting of the coordinator on a half time basis, an assistant coordinator full time, a technician and secretary, both part time) provides direct assistance to the Environmental Advisory Council, administers the coordination budget, directly assists non-government organizations and takes a lead role in developing a system of informal education.

Currently, the coordination budget to implement the Strategy amounts to approximately $260,000 annually or about two dollars per capita. This has been stretched using Federal programs.

The Action Plan for implementation of the Conservation Strategy identifies eight objectives, some of which are recognized to be long-term. They are as follows:

1) a sustainable development component in all relevant Economic Regional Development Agreements (ERDA's) as they are reviewed and renewed;

2) an environmental or sustainable development component in the planning processes in all relevant government departments;

3) the continued funding of local projects as demonstrations;

4) increased conservation study in the school system;

5) establishing a pilot conservation demonstration project on a significant watershed;

6) realignment of the role of the Environmental Advisory Council;

7) a Province wide policy for subdivisions within coastal areas;

8) informal education.

An additional set of activities has been geared to legislative changes, the promotion of developing Crown lands policy and provincial land use policy, and the development of Federal/Provincial Agreements.

In terms of operation the approach to implementation recognizes that, initially, processes must be treated as being as important as products because of a conviction that "good products require good processes". A second important part of the approach has involved the maximum use of existing agencies, both government and non-government. A third part of the approach has been to recognize the importance of integrating the newly established function of provincial land use and development policy into the process, at least in part. Finally, although the emphasis has been on existing agencies, it was recognized that some new mechanisms were necessary to make the process work. These included the development of a nine member provincial agency or department land use coordinating committee, established as part of the provincial land use and development policy initiative, and the eleven-agency coordinating committee at the federal/provincial level under the Memorandum of Understanding on Conservation and Development, as well as several ad hoc arrangements.

New Directions

The Prince Edward Island Conservation Strategy is now about two years old. The enthusiasm for it and the significant, albeit limited, successes to date along with the experience gained suggest a need for two major components to be added. The first of these is to develop a much better understanding of what sustainable development means in terms of Prince Edward Island's private sector. This task has been assigned to the Prince Edward Island Round Table on Environment and Economy with possible emphasis on the following:

a) informal education;
b) resource development;
c) manufacturing or processing operations;
d) pollution control;
e) utilization of non-government resources such as educational interests and professional or job related organizations;
f) non-government funding;
g) research needs and opportunities;
h) business opportunities in sustainable development.

The second major component needs to focus on the redefined and strengthened land use planning role which the 1988 Planning Act has given to municipalities. Because of the nature of the municipal system in Prince Edward Island this focus will probably be on municipalities acting jointly.

Recommendations

The organizing team for this workshop requested that speakers devote some time to the question of recommendations in the development of conservation strategies. Given the varying needs of different jurisdictions this is no easy task and one which is made even more difficult by the recognition that different jurisdictions are rooted in different traditions and at different stages in their sensitivity to and acceptance of the concept of sustainable development. Nevertheless, I hope that the following suggestions are of some benefit in considering approaches to the development of these strategies:

1) Focus initially on process to ensure that the "infrastructure" which will enable implementation to occur is built as a part of the creation of the strategy itself. The obvious extension of this is that the base needs to be broad enough to include the major players, that is, governments, non-government organizations, the private sector and the general public.

2) Governments have a very strong proclivity to seek legislative solutions to problems. Equal billing needs to be given to both fiscal and educational approaches and tools.

3) Maximize the use of existing resources - do not reinvent the wheel.

4) Seek a broad mandate, that is, from governments, from non-government organizations from the private sector and the general public but "bell the cat" in terms of assigning responsibilities to specific bodies and direct the implementation to specific tasks.

5) See the issues as opportunities as well as problems.

6) Make the approach "pro-development" rather than "anti-development". The country needs to continue to develop. One of the important lessons from the Brundtland Commission is that economic poverty creates the climate for less, not more, public sensitivity to the environment. To continue to develop, provided the development is sustainable, is to build into our society the increased capability and likelihood that the environment will be recognized for what it is - our human habitat and the essential key to our future well-being economically, socially, and physically.

ANNEX B

REPORT ON THE INUIT REGIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY

by Nancy Doubleday

First I wish to apologize to the Workshop organizers and participants for being unable to participate during the Workshop. By way of explanation, I would like to tell you that it was necessary for me to pay a last visit to my father. I am grateful to the organizers for their understanding and for the opportunity to share this brief account of the Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy with you through the Workshop Proceedings.

The Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy (IRCS) is a project of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC). The ICC is an international non-governmental organization representing Inuit of Greenland, Canada, and Alaska. The participation of Siberian Inuit is under negotiation. Formation of the ICC was initiated in 1977 through the inspiration of the late Eben Hopson, Mayor of the North Slope Borough. The ICC Charter was formally adopted in 1980. Concern for the recognition of Inuit rights and for protection of the Arctic environment have been driving forces of ICC activity since its inception.

The structure of the ICC includes a General Assembly composed of 3 delegations of 18 members each; an Executive Council and President. Each delegation is composed of representatives of regional Inuit organizations. The General Assembly meets every three years and is the primary policy-setting authority. At each General Assembly a wide array of issues of importance to Inuit are considered and addressed by way of resolution of the Assembly. In 1983 the ICC General Assembly mandated development of a comprehensive Arctic policy by the ICC, as a means of addressing the many great concerns of Inuit for their rights, their way of life and the Arctic environment. Arctic policy principles have been developed and adopted by the ICC in many areas.

The implementation of the Arctic policy principles which have been adopted has been a cause for concern, because while ICC has the power to develop policy, as a non-governmental organization it does not have the authority to legislate their implementation. The question of implementation has been viewed with particular concern with respect to protection of the Arctic environment and of the Inuit way of life. Discussions of approaches to development of an environmental strategy resulted in the development of a framework for an Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy, based on the World Conservation Strategy. The decision was made to develop the IRCS at the 1986 General Assembly.

Progress with respect to the development and implementation of the IRCS has been tied to the availability of funding and opportunities for advancement through cooperative initiatives such as the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy. Cooperation with Arctic governments, international organizations and others with an interest in Arctic issues is essential to the success of the IRCS, and encouragement of such cooperation is clearly identified by the ICC as an important contribution to the advancement of sustainable development in the Arctic.

As in the case of other strategies, the IRCS continues to evolve to encompass new changes in the environmental and policy contexts. In the industrialized regions, the focus of conservation initiatives emphasized "protection", perhaps in recognition of how little remained undeveloped. From the outset it was recognized that as an underdeveloped region, the Arctic needs development. However because of the culture and values of the Inuit way of life, it was quite clear that development would only truly meet the needs of Inuit if it was "appropriate", both environmentally and culturally. Thus the approach of the IRCS, even before the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, was to address conservation and development as interdependent goals. Consequently, the introduction of "sustainable development" to the international policy context has not required a major conceptual change in the IRCS framework. Other changes in context such as concern regarding global warming, toxic contamination of Arctic ecosystems and ozone depletion, do require some adaptation. The process of strategy development must be dynamic enough to accommodate these changes.

The ICC recognizes that bi-lateral and multi-lateral approaches are required in order to address concerns like toxic contaminants, which are airborne and which originate in industrialized regions. On the other hand, recognition of the traditional knowledge of Inuit and Inuit rights with respect to management of resources and the need for community-based development in order to sustain communities and cultural values require that application of sustainable development must be determined at local and regional levels. The IRCS does not predetermine decisions of local and regional authorities, rather it is intended that the IRCS support and facilitate activities at the local and regional levels by promoting and defending them nationally and internationally. This approach is possible because while a range of views exist among Inuit communities, Inuit culture, traditions and values provide the foundation for a unified outlook.

The IRCS is a project of the ICC, but its growth and development are strongly influenced by the activities of related Inuit organizations. For example, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada is coordinating development of a Sealing Strategy within the IRCS framework, as an example of appropriate sustainable development. The activities of the land claims organizations are also intrinsic to the development and implementation of the IRCS, as are the activities of other mandated Inuit organizations.

Priorities for the work of the IRCS as determined by the ICC General Assembly in 1989 include:

1) education based on traditional values that passes on traditional knowledge of the elders, with respect to the animals and plants and the environment, to the children to ensure the survival of Inuit as a people based on land and living resources;

2) shared resource data collection through the database and research that promotes understanding of populations of animals as a whole;

3) exploration of multi-species management approaches in order to avoid management strategies focused on a single species;

4) development of a protected areas network to ensure that significant protection is provided for critical habitats and for ranges of species of vital importance;

5) monitoring of CITES and other international agreements;

6) establishment of standards for environmental protection at all levels from local municipalities to the global international level in order to deal with issues like transboundary pollution, CFC destruction of the ozone layer, toxic contaminants such as PCBs and heavy metals;

7) advancement of the proposal for a circumpolar conservation strategy to facilitate cooperation in the circumpolar region;

8) advancement of recognition of Inuit rights with respect to environment, development and subsistence; to respond to human needs of those affected by environmental disasters like EXXON Valdez; and to promote wise use of resources by those who depend on them; and

9) formulation of approaches to non-renewable resource and energy development which support sustainable utilization of renewable resources.

The IRCS completes the cycle linking local, regional and international environmental and economic concerns and international, regional and local environmental and economic effects, by actively promoting the rights and responsibilities of Inuit with respect to sustainable development and protection of the Arctic environment in a manner that is consistent with the policy of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. The Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy has received the support of IUCN and has been awarded the Global 500 Award by the United Nations Environment Program.

ANNEX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

PANELISTS

Dr. Tim McTiernan
Director
Policy & Planning Branch
Department of Renewable Resources
Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6

Mr. Mike Kelly
Senior Research Officer
Environmental Council of Alberta
8th Floor Weber Centre
5555 Calgary Trail Southbound
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5P9

Ms. Elizabeth Snider
Chief
Northern Fisheries Operations
Pacific & Fresh Water Fisheries
200 Kent Street, Station 1182
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E6

M. Bertrand Tétreault
Président
Conseil de la conservation et de
l'environnement
800, Place d'Youville, 19e étage
Québec (Québec)
G1R 3P4

Mr. Jamie Bastedo
Senior Policy Analyst
Policy & Planning Division
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of Northwest Territories
Box 1320
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

Ms. Diane Griffin
Executive Director
Island Nature Trust
P.O. Box 265
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C1A 7K4

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Mr. Mike Goffin
Executive Secretary
CORE - Ontario Region
Environment Canada
7th Floor
25 St. Clair Avenue East
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1M2

Mr. Peter Leblanc
Executive Secretary
Committee of Regional Executives (CORE)
C&P, Atlantic Region
Environment Canada
15th Floor, Queen Square
45 Alderney Drive
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 2N6

Mr. K. Ogilvie
Executive Director
Canadian Environmental Advisory Council
25th Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mrs. V. Hallivell
Project Coordinator
Canadian Environmental Advisory Council
25th Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Dr. E.F. Roots
Science Advisor
Canadian Environmental Advisory Council
25th Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mr. Julian Inglis
Chief
Land Use Planning and Conservation
Natural Resources & Economic
Development Branch
Department of Indian and Northern
Affairs
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH4

Mr. Garry Schaefer
Chief, Scientific Services Division
Atmospheric Environment Service
Environment Canada
9th Floor
266 Graham Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3V4

Mr. Terry Chiasson
Committee of Regional
Executives (CORE)
C&P, Pacific Region
Environment Canada
3rd Floor, Kapilano
100 Park Royal South
West Vancouver, British Columbia
V7T 1A2

Mr. David W.I. Marshall
Director
Pacific, Western & Northern Region
FEARO
510 - 750 Cambie Street
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6B 2P2

M. Albin Tremblay
Directeur
Direction Analyse & Coordination
C&P, Région du Québec
Environnement Canada
1141, Route de l'Eglise
6e étage, C.P. 10100
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
G1V 4H5

Mr. Hasu Naik
Senior Water Resources Planner
Inland Waters Directorate
W&N Region, Environment Canada
1901 Victoria Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3R4

Mr. Zal Davar
Water Resources Economist
Inland Waters Directorate
Atlantic Region, Environment Canada
45 Alderney Drive, 4th Floor
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 2N6

Mr. Gerry Fitzsimmons
Director
Federal/Provincial Relations
Corporate Policy Group
Environment Canada
22nd Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mr. Ron Hopkinson
Officer in Charge
Scientific Services Division
AES Regina, Environment Canada
Airport Operations Building
P.O. Box 4800
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3Y4

Mr. John Keefe
Head, Planning and Conservation
Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
Queen Square
45 Alderney Drive, 4th Floor
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 2N6

Ms. Nola K. Seymoar
Director General
Policy and Coordination
Environment Canada
22nd Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Ms. Mary Adams
Director, Policy
FEARO
Fontaine Building, 13th Floor
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mr. Peter Croal
Geologist - Hydrogeologist
DIAND
200 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard
Room 725
Hull, Quebec
J8X 1E1

Dr. Sandy D'Aquino
Head, Planning Division
Water Planning Management Branch
IWD, Pacific & Yukon Region
Environment Canada
502 - 1001 West Pender Street
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6E 2M9

Dr. Vinod R. Marwaha
Corporate Advisor
Conservation and Protection
W&N Region, Environment Canada
Twin Atria No. 2
4999 - 98 Avenue, Room 210
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X3

Mr. Bill Brakel
Economic Advisor
Conservation and Protection
W&N Region, Environment Canada
Twin Atria No. 2
4999 - 98 Avenue, Room 210
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X3

Dr. Leslie Whitby
Director
Sustainable Development Branch
Environment Canada
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Dr. E.W. Manning
Associate Director
Sustainable Development Branch
Environment Canada
10th floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Ms. Ruth McKechnie
Head, Policy & Strategy
Development Section
Sustainable Development Branch
Environment Canada
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mr. Jean-Yves Cayen
Analyst, Canadian Parks Service
Environment Canada
3rd Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Ms. Annick LeHénaff
Research Officer
Sustainable Development Branch
Environment Canada
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Mr. Dennis O'Farrell
Research Officer
Sustainable Development Branch
Environment Canada
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

Ms. Mary Hegan
Health Promotion Directorate
National Health and Welfare
Jeanne Mance Building
de l'Eglantine Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 1B4

Mr. Ray Rivers
Head, Planning Division
IWD, Ontario Region
Environment Canada
867 Lakeshore Road, Box 5050
Burlington, Ontario
L7R 4A6

Mr. Bill Sinclair
Senior Economist
Conservation and Protection
Pacific Region, Environment Canada
3rd Floor, Kapilano
100 Park Royal South
West Vancouver, British Columbia
V7T 1A2

Mr. Richard Bill
International Programs Officer
Inland Waters, Environment Canada
Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3

NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Robert Winsor
Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands
Department of Environment and Lands
Government of Newfoundland
Confederation Building,
4th Floor, West Block
P.O. Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Mr. David Jeans
Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment
Department of Environment and Lands
Confederation Building
West Block
P.O. Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Creighton Brisco
Co-ordinator, Nova Scotia Round Table
Department of Environment
P.O. Box 2107
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3B7

Dr. S.A.M. Conover
International Program Co-ordinator
School for Resource and
Environmental Studies
Dalhousie University
1312 Robie Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3H 3E2

Ms. Susan Holtz
Vice-Chair Nova Scotia Round Table
4 Umlah's Road
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3P 2G6

Mr. Raymond Lamoureux
Principal, Sustainable Development
Environmental Management Consultants
34 Cranston Avenue
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 3G4

NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. Ronald Searles
Assistant Deputy Minister
Environmental Protection Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs
and Environment
Government of New Brunswick
520 King Street, 4th Floor
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 6G3

Dr. David Besner
Executive Secretary
New Brunswick Round Table on
Environment and Economy
Department of Municipal Affairs
and Environment
Government of New Brunswick
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

M. Louis Lapierre
Directeur
Département de Biologie
Faculté des Sciences et de Génie
Université de Moncton
Moncton, New Brunswick
E1A 3E9

Ms. Jeanne Tait
Senior Policy Planner
Policy Secretariat
Government of New Brunswick
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

QUEBEC

M. Gérald Divay
Sous-ministre adjoint
Ministère de l'environnement
3900, rue Marly
Ste-Foy (Québec)
G1X 4E4

M. Jean Vachon
Coordonateur
Secrétariat à la Table Ronde environnementale
3900, rue Marly, 6e étage
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
G1X 4E4

Mme H.C. Connor-Lajambe
Directrice de l'analyse des politiques énergétiques
1599, rue Bourdon
St-Bruno de Montarville (Québec)
J3V 4T6

M. Adam Karpinski
Conseiller en milieu humain
Vice-présidence Environnement
Hydro-Québec
800 boulevard de Maisonneuve est
16e étage
Montréal (Québec)
H2L 4L8

ONTARIO

Mr. Rick Findlay
Director
Secretariat to Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy
10th Floor, 790 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1N8

Mr. J.D. Cook
Manager
Environmental Affairs Division
ESSO Petroleum Canada
55 St. Clair Avenue West, Room 3026
Toronto, Ontario
M5W 2J8

Mr. Walter Giles
Associate Deputy Minister
Intergovernmental Relations and Strategic Projects Division
Ministry of the Environment
Government of Ontario
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 14th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4V 1P5

Mr. Rob Arnot
Secretariat to Ontario
Round Table on Environment Economy
790 Bay Street, 10th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1N8

Mr. Gary Gallon
Special Assistant, Policy
Ontario MOE
15th Floor, 135 St. Clair Avenue West
Toronto, Ontario
M4V 1P5

Mr. Chris Winter
Research Director
Conservation Council of Ontario
202-74 Victoria
Toronto, Ontario
M5C 2A5

Mr. Paul Griss
Executive Director
Canadian Nature Federation
453 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 6Z4

Mr. Nigel Richardson
Consultant
N.H. Richardson Consulting
203 Old Orchard Grove
Toronto, Ontario
M5M 2E6

Ms. Edi Smockum
Chairman's Office
Economic Development Division
Metropolitan Toronto
390 Bay Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 3V7

Mr. Brian Kelly
President
Marbek Resource Consultants
Suite 407, 2211 Riverside Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1H 7X5

M. François Bregha
Directeur
Etude de politiques
Académie Rawson
Suite 404, 1 Nicholas
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7

MANITOBA

Mr. R.L. Carter
Chairperson
Conservation Strategy Association
of Manitoba
c/o Manitoba Environmental Network
202-128 James Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3B 0N8

Mr. Ross Thomasson
Manitoba Department of
Natural Resources
1495 St. James
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

Mr. James Potton
Director
Communications, Economics and Planning
Manitoba Department of Natural Resources
1495 St. James Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

Mr. Herb Schellenberg
Agricultural Resource Economist
Policy and Economics
Manitoba Agriculture
903-401 York Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0P8

Dr. Edward Onyebuchi
Policy Analyst
Sustainable Development
Coordination Unit
Province of Manitoba
960-330 St. Mary Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3Z5

Ms. Susan Eros
Policy Analyst
Sustainable Development
Coordination Unit
Province of Manitoba
960-330 St. Mary Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3Z5

Professor R. Fenton
Department of Economics
University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3B 2E9

Dr. Tom Booth
Professor, Botany Department
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2WZ

Mr. Wayne Neily
Manitoba Environmental Council
Box 17
Room 550, 500 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3X1

Mr. Elmer Stobbe
Professor, Plant Science
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2

Mr. Jake Nichol
Land Resource Specialist
Manitoba Agriculture
903-401 York Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0P8

Mr. Robert Sopuck
Director
Sustainable Development
Coordination Unit
Province of Manitoba
Room 14, Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Mr. Jim Irwin
World Biosphere Centre
c/o John W. Burgess
363 - 10th Street
P.O. Box 605
Brandon, Manitoba
R7A 5Z7

Mr. Donald McDonald
World Biosphere Centre
c/o John W. Burgess
363 - 10th Street
P.O. Box 605
Brandon, Manitoba
R7A 5Z7

SASKATCHEWAN

Ms. Betty Collins
Director Strategic Planning Branch
Environmental Assessment Branch
Saskatchewan Environment and
Public Safety
3085 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B1

Mr. Tom Galimberti
Saskatchewan Environment and
Public Safety
Walter Scott Building
3085 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B1

Mr. Wayne Pepper
Manager
Integrated Resource Policy Unit
Saskatchewan Parks
Recreation and Culture
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Mr. John Kiss
Provincial Soils Specialist
Saskatchewan Agriculture
3085 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B1

Mr. Timothy Cheesman
Community Planning Services Branch
Department of Rural Development
Government of Saskatchewan
3130 - 8th Street East
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7K 2H6

Dr. David Henry
Associate professor of Science/Member
of the Saskatchewan Round Table
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College
University of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0A2

ALBERTA

Ms. Robyn Usher
Biologist/Member Alberta Conservation
Strategy Steering Committee
Suite 1, 715 6th Street, N.E.
Calgary, Alberta
T2E 6X2

Mr. Bill Shaw
Deputy Director
Red Deer Regional Planning Commission
2830 - Bremmer Avenue
Red Deer, Alberta
T4R 1M9

Mr. Per Andersen
Director
Policy Secretariat
Department of Forestry, Lands
and Wildlife
Bramalea Building, 4th Floor
9920 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C6

Mr. J.K. O'Neil
Associate Planner
Planning Division
Alberta Environment
9th Floor, Oxbridge Place
9820 - 106 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2J6

Mr. Lee McKibben
Head, Land Use Branch
Alberta Environment
6th Floor, Oxbridge Place
9820 - 106 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2J6

Ms. Wesley Shennan
Senior Planner
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional
Planning Commission
10th Floor, 10303 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3N6

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Jamey Alley
Cabinet Secretariat & Task Force
Secretariat
Office of the Premier
Province of British Columbia
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4

Mr. Robert Prescott-Allen
PADATA
627 Aquarius Road, RR 2
Victoria, British Columbia
V9B 5B4

Mr. Stuart Gale
Director, Tourism Product & Planning
Ministry of Tourism & Provincial
Secretary of British Columbia
1117 Wharf Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8W 2E2

Mr. Phil Sanderson
Economic Development Co-ordinator
Burnaby Planning & Building
Inspection Department
District of Burnaby
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, British Colombia
V5G 1M2

Dr. P.M. Chapman
E.V.S. Consultants Ltd.
195 Pemberton Avenue
North Vancouver, British Columbia
V7P 2R4

Mr. Bill Rees
Associate Professor
School of Community and
Regional Planning
University of British Columbia
6333 Memorial Road
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6T 1W5

YUKON

Mr. Art Webster
Minister
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of Yukon
Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6

OTHERS

Mr. Steven Kensey
Executive Director
Land Conservation
Council of New South Wales
Level 15, 55 Lavender Street
Milson's Point
NSW 2060, Australia

ANNEX D

LIST OF CONSERVATION/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY CONTACTS

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Lee Doney
Executive Director and Secretary
British Columbia Round Table on
Environment and Economy
548 Michigan Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
(604) 387-5422
Fax: (604) 356-7074

ALBERTA

Mr. John Lilley
Senior Research Officer
Environment Council of Alberta
8th Floor, Weber Centre
5555, Calgary Trail Southbound
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5P9
(403) 427-5792

SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Sheldon McLeod
Executive Secretary
Saskatchewan Round Table on
Environment and Economy
Secretariat
Saskatchewan Environment and
Public Safety
Walter Scott Building
3085 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B1
Fax: (306) 787-0197

MANITOBA

Mr. Robert Sopock
Director
Sustainable Development
Coordination Unit
Government of Manitoba
305 - 155 Carleton St.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3H8
Fax: (204) 945-0090

ONTARIO

Mr. Rick Findlay
Director
Ontario Round Table on
Environment and Economy
790 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1N8
Fax: (416) 586-2197

QUÉBEC

M. Bertrand Tétreault
Président
Conseil de la conservation et
de l'environnement
800 Place d'Youville
Québec (Québec)
G1R 3P4
Fax: (418) 646-1693

M. Jean Vachon
Coordinateur
Table ronde sur l'environnement et
l'économie
Ministère de l'environnement
3900, Marly
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
G1X 4E4
Fax: (418) 643-3754

NEW BRUNSWICK

Dr. David Besner
Executive Secretary
New Brunswick Round Table
on Environment and Economy
Department of Municipal Affairs
and Environment
Government of New Brunswick
364 Argyle Street, 2nd Floor
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 6G3
Fax: (506) 453-2263

NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Creighton Brisco
Provincial Co-ordinator
Nova Scotia Round Table
Government of Nova Scotia
Terminal Building, 5th Floor
5151 Terminal Road
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3B7
Fax: (902) 424-0503

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	Mr. Bruce Smith Provincial Conservation Strategy Department of Environment P.O. Box 2000 Charlottetown, P.E.I. C1A 7N8 Fax: (902) 892-3420
NEWFOUNDLAND	Mr. David Jeans Assistant Deputy Minister Environment Department of Lands and Environment Confederation Square 4th Floor, West Block P.O. Box 4750 St.John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7 Fax: (709) 576-1930
YUKON	Mr. Stephan Fuller Manager Policy Analysis and Development Policy and Planning Branch Department of Renewable Resources Government of Yukon P.O. Box 2703 Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 2C6 Fax: (403) 667-3641
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	Mr. Jamie Bastedo Senior Policy Analyst Department of Renewable Resources Government of the Northwest Territories P.O. Box 1320 Yellowknife, N.W.T. X1A 2L9 Fax: (403) 873-0221
THE ARCTIC MARINE CONSERVATION STRATEGY	Ms. Elizabeth Snider Chief Northern Fisheries Operations Fisheries and Oceans Canada 200 Kent Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6 Fax: (613) 996-9055

THE INUIT REGIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Ms. Nancy Doubleday
International Environmental
Co-ordinator
Inuit Circumpolar Conference
Suite 510, 170 Laurier Avenue W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Fax: (613) 234-1991

ENVIRONMENT CANADA

Ms. Ruth McKechnie
Head, Policy and Strategy
Development Section
Sustainable Development Branch
Corporate Policy Group
10th Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3
Fax: (819) 953-3972

ANNEX E

STATUS OF PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

The Prince Edward Island Strategy is currently being implemented. Several initiatives have been undertaken in support of the implementation of the strategy including the Island Conservation Assistance Program to promote summer youth employment, a workshop on erosion control along highways, a young environmentalist program to create jobs in conservation, a scenic heritage road program and a Natural Areas Protection Act and associated designations. In addition, a Royal Commission on Land Ownership and Land Use established by the Premier last year, will be reporting to Cabinet early in 1990 on the results of public hearings on land use issues in the province. Since the introduction of the Conservation Strategy, the Prince Edward Island Environmental Advisory Council has produced a report which reviews progress on recommendations contained in the strategy.

Lead Agency
Department of Environment

Background Documents
"Prince Edward Island Conservation Strategy"
P.E.I. Environmental Advisory Council: "Annual Report 1987-1988"
Strategy Coordination Office: "Coordinating Activities Report - Period Ending December 30, 1988" (1989)

Date of Completion
1987

NOVA SCOTIA

The nucleus of a conservation strategy steering committee has been created under the Nova Scotia Round Table, to direct the preparation of a mission statement and process outline for actively involving the private sector. Once approval is received from Cabinet to proceed, expected early in 1990, it is anticipated that this committee will be expanded to include representatives from government, the business and academic communities, and environmental interest groups to oversee completion of the strategy.

Preliminary plans call for the initiation of public workshops and hearings on the objectives and content of a Nova Scotia conservation strategy in late spring 1990.

Lead Agency
Nova Scotia Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
Proceedings from the 1989 Conference: "Building Partnerships for Environmentally Sound Development in Nova Scotia" (Pending).

School for Resources and Environmental Studies: "Towards a Conservation Strategy for the People and Resources of Nova Scotia" (1986)

Proposed Date of Completion
1992

NEW BRUNSWICK

A Steering Committee reporting to the Premier's Round Table on Environment and Economy, has been established to coordinate all the activities related to the development of a sustainable development/conservation strategy. The Steering Committee has distributed an information kit which explains why sustainable development is needed now, proposes a definition of and principles for sustainable development, offers brief background papers on thirteen sectors in order to stimulate discussion, and describes the process that will be used in developing a strategy.

The process calls for an initial round of public consultation to focus public attention, inform the public about some of the pertinent issues, and most importantly to listen to the concerns of the public. Thirteen sectoral groups will then be established and will be preparing sectoral reports including agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, water/air/land, energy, recreation and tourism, fisheries and aquaculture, environmental education and information, rural and urban development, natural areas, forestry, wildlife and mining. The final reports will be integrated along with concerns raised during consultations and will form a draft strategy document that will be released at the end of 1990 for further consultations.

Lead Agency
Premier's Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
"Sustainable Development for New Brunswick"

Proposed Date of Completion
1992

NEWFOUNDLAND

An executive Committee on Sustainable Development under the chairmanship of the Deputy Minister (DM) of Environment and Lands is comprised of DM's of several departments and is to advise the Government on the development of an action plan for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy (NTFEE). It will specifically prepare recommendations on the development of a provincial conservation strategy.

Lead Agency
Not determined

Proposed Date of Completion
1992

QUEBEC

The Quebec Round Table on Environment and Economy has been mandated to prepare a sustainable development action plan which aims at integrating environmental considerations within economic and policy decisions. It includes projects, currently occurring or proposed that exemplify sustainable development objectives at all levels whether local, regional or provincial. A first draft of the action plan was presented at a forum held last November sponsored by the Round Table. This forum provided the opportunity for all to comment on the projects and initiatives included in the action plan, all of which will be considered by the Round Table while finalizing the draft. The final action plan will also integrate recommendations arising from the extensive consultations undertaken last year by the Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement.

Lead Agency
Quebec Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
Table Ronde sur l'environnement et l'économie: "Document de travail pour la préparation d'un plan d'action sur le développement durable au québec". Forum québécois sur le développement durable (1989)

Conseil de la conservation et de l'environnement: "Vers une stratégie québécoise de la conservation et du développement" (1988)

Proposed Date of Completion
1990

ONTARIO

In January 1990 the Ontario Round Table will prepare a "Challenge Paper". This will be followed by public and stakeholder consultations leading to the development of a second Challenge Paper. Task forces will develop sectoral action plans incorporating public input. The Round Table will review and consolidate the action plans to produce the final strategy which will provide specific goals for government and the private sector. The development process will include the establishment of demonstration projects.

Lead Agency
The Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
The Conservation Council of Ontario:
"Towards a Conservation Strategy for Ontario" (1986)
"An Environmental Strategy for Ontario" (1989)

Ontario Round Table:
"Challenge Paper #1" (pending)
"Challenge Paper #2" (pending)
"Sectoral Action Plans" (pending)

Proposed Date of Completion
January 1992

MANITOBA

The Sustainable Development Unit of the Government of Manitoba is the Secretariat to the Manitoba Round Table and is preparing a core document, **Manitobans' Sustainable Development Strategy**. This document looks at the general principles of sustainable development and will be discussed by the Round Table in January 1990. A first draft of of the Sustainable Development Strategy is to be completed by spring of 1990, submitted to Cabinet for initial approval and then used as the basis for public consultations. Work is already proceeding on the Land and Water Strategy which will be a component of the overall strategy.

Lead Agency
Manitoba Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
"Land and Water Strategy: Soil Workbook" (1989)
"Land and Water Strategy: Water Workbook" (1989)
"Land and Water Strategy: Strategy for Forests" (pending)
"Manitobans' Sustainable Development Strategy" (pending)

Proposed Date of Completion
May 1991

SASKATCHEWAN

The Saskatchewan Round Table, at its next meeting of January 24 and 25, 1990, will be revieving a prospectus which is now being developed by the Round Table Secretariat. The prospectus will discuss the concept of a strategy and the process for its development. A possible process the Round Table will be considering is the development of a draft strategy based on sectoral analyses, to be ready by spring 1991. Such a draft would provide the basis for public consultations.

Lead Agency
Saskatchewan Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
Prospectus (pending)

Proposed Date of Completion
November 1991

ALBERTA

The province is now establishing its Round Table on Environment and Economy, which will have a mandate to advise the government on a sustainable development strategy. The work of the Round Table on a sustainable development strategy is expected to complement the work done to-date on a Conservation Strategy by the Public Advisory Committees to the Environment Council of Alberta (ECA). In addition to the "Prospectus for an Alberta Conservation Strategy", first published in 1986, thirteen background sector papers are now available; eight more are expected to be released in the coming months. All of these documents were prepared with input form a variety of agencies and individuals and are available from the Environment Council. A draft document is expected to be published this spring, describing a decision structure based on sustainable development principles that could be used to help move Alberta in the direction of sustainable resource use.

Lead Agencies
Alberta Round Table on Environment and Economy
& Environment Council of Alberta

Background Documents
Public Advisory Committees to the Environment Council of Alberta:
- "Prospectus for an Alberta Conservation Strategy" (1986)
- 21 Sectoral Papers (13 already published)

Proposed Date of Completion
Early 1992

BRITISH COLUMBIA

The British Columbia Task Force on Environment and Economy has recommended the formation of a provincial Round Table on Environment and Economy with a mandate which includes the responsibility for developing a strategy for achieving sustainable development. The Secretariat for the Round Table has been established and the determination of membership is expected in early 1990. The Task Force Report recommends the encouragement of input from all user groups and the general public.

Lead Agency
The British Columbia Round Table on Environment and Economy

Background Documents
"Sustaining the Living Land: The Report of the British Columbia Task Force on Environment and Economy" (1989)

Proposed Date of Completion
1992

YUKON

The Strategy is in its final drafting stages. Work on the preparation of the Strategy began in 1987 and extensive consultations have been held since the release of the public discussion paper. Concluding consultations are taking place with the Council of Yukon Indians and the newly formed Yukon Council on Environment and Economy (the equivalent of a round table). The Council will be overseeing the implementation of both the Conservation Strategy and the Yukon Economic Strategy.

Lead Agency
Department of Renewable Resources, Government of the Yukon

Background Documents
"Towards a Yukon Conservation Strategy" (1987)
"Building a Conservation Strategy for the Yukon: a Public Discussion Paper" (1988)
"Yukon Conservation Strategy: Draft" (1989)

Proposed Date of Completion
February 1990

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

The NWT Strategy is being developed in two phases, the Policy and the Action Plan. The Policy portion, based on the discussion paper and public consultations, will be submitted to Cabinet in early 1990. Further consultations and development of the Action Plan will proceed after approval of the Policy. It is proposed that part of the Action Plan will include the development of a Round Table.

Lead Agency
Department of Renewable Resources, Government of Northwest Territories

Background Documents
"Sustainable Development in the Northwest Territories: Balancing Conservation and Development" (1989)

Proposed Date of Completion
December 1990